THE American POLITICAL SCIENCE Review

Vol. XLIX — September, 1955 — No. 3

Bifactional Rivalry as an Alternative to Two-Party Competition in Louisiana . . . *Allan P. Sindler* . . . *641*
Sovereignty and Democracy in the Japanese Constitution . . *Kazuo Kawai* . . . *663*
The French Council of State: Its Role in the Formulation and Implementation of Administrative Law . . . *Georges Langrod* . . . *673*
The Development of Political Parties in Western Nigeria . . *Peter C. Lloyd* . . . *693*
The New Zealand Labor Party . . . *Louise Overacker* . . . *708*
Toward a Theory of International Politics . . . *Kenneth W. Thompson* *733*
Indian and Western Political Thought: Coalescence or Clash? . . . *Norman D. Palmer* . . . *747*
Judicial Self-Restraint . . . *John P. Roche* . . . *762*
Party Voting in American State Legislatures . . . *Malcolm E. Jewell* . . . *773*
Doctoral Dissertations in Political Science in American Universities . . . *William C. Seyler (comp.)* . . . *792*
Book Reviews, Notes, and Bibliography . . . *Emmette S. Redford (ed.)* . . . *827*
  A Survey of Materials for the Study of Military Management . . . *Paul P. Van Riper* . . . *828*
News and Notes . . . *Albert L. Sturm (ed.)* . . *927*

(For list of book reviews, see page 827)

Published quarterly by

THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

NEW ADDRESS: 1726 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

Published quarterly by The American Political Science Association

EDITORIAL BOARD

Hugh L. Elsbree, *Managing Editor, Library of Congress*

V. O. Key, Jr., *Associate Editor, Harvard University*

James L. McCamy, *Associate Editor, University of Wisconsin*

Taylor Cole, *Duke University*

Henry W. Ehrmann, *University of Colorado*

Harvey C. Mansfield, *Ohio State University*

C. Herman Pritchett, *University of Chicago*

Francis O. Wilcox, *Washington, D.C.*

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATES

Emmette S. Redford, *Book Review Editor, University of Texas*

Albert L. Sturm, *News and Notes Editor, West Virginia University*

Franklin L. Burdette, *University of Maryland*

William H. Roberts, *Catholic University*

H. Arthur Steiner, *University of California (Los Angeles)*

Francis G. Wilson, *University of Illinois*

Herbert A. Simon, *Carnegie Institute of Technology*

EDITORIAL OFFICE

Managing Editor
The American Political Science Review
1726 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington 6, D.C.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Executive Director
The American Political Science Association
1726 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington 6, D.C.

The American Political Science Review, published quarterly during the months of March, June, September, and December, is supplied to all members of The American Political Science Association. Individual and institutional memberships are $10.00 a year ($4.00 for graduate and undergraduate students). One dollar should be added for foreign postage.

Current issues are priced at $2.50 per copy. Prices of other issues are furnished on request.

Applications for membership, orders for the Review, and remittances should be addressed to the Executive Director, The American Political Science Association, 1726 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington 6, D.C. *Notices of change of address* should be received in the Washington office by the 5th day of the month of publication.

Correspondence concerning contributions to the Review should be addressed to Hugh L. Elsbree, The American Political Science Review, 1726 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.; *books intended for review*, to Emmette S. Redford, University of Texas, Austin, Texas; *News and Notes items*, to Albert L. Sturm, West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia.

Articles and notes appearing in the Review before the June, 1953 issue were indexed in *The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature*. The *International Index to Periodicals* indexes current issues. Microfilm of the Review, beginning with Volume 46, may be obtained from University Microfilms, 313 North First Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Office of publication: 450 Ahnaip Street, Menasha, Wisconsin.
Foreign Agent: P. S. King and Staples, Ltd., Great Smith Street, Westminster, London.
Entered as second class matter at the post office at Menasha, Wisconsin, under the Act of August 4, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized May 12, 1926.

Printed in the United States of America by George Banta Publishing Company, Menasha, Wisconsin.

Copyright, 1955, by The American Political Science Association.

The American
Political Science Review

VOL. XLIX SEPTEMBER, 1955 NO. 3

BIFACTIONAL RIVALRY AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO TWO-PARTY COMPETITION IN LOUISIANA*

ALLAN P. SINDLER
Yale University

As the panacea for their political ills, Southern states frequently have been counseled to develop competitive two-party systems. Presumably the very demonstration of the superiority of the bipartisan system in itself would go a long way toward achieving that desideratum. Not the least of the unhappy consequences of this uncritical approach was the accompanying tendency to lump non-two-party Southern states into the single category of "the one-party South." Fortunately, the rich diversity of Southern political processes recently has been uncovered and subjected to systematic analysis.[1] For those states of the South which lack an effective opposition party, it has been shown that Democratic politics runs the gamut from multifactional chaos to a structured and disciplined bifactionalism. Louisiana is properly classified in the latter camp, which attests to at least some beneficial by-products of charismatic demagogy. In the absence of any reasonable expectation of the imminent rejuvenation of the Republican party in Louisiana, a realistic appraisal of the state's politics must eschew exhortation and concentrate upon an empirical examination of the operation of Democratic bifactionalism.

This paper proposes to examine the extent to which Louisiana's bifactionalism has given durable structure and meaning to its state and parish (county) politics and the degree to which it approximates the workings of a two-party system. The analysis is limited, however, by the fact that no systematic investigation as yet has been undertaken which attempts to measure the extent to which the assumptions and claims made on behalf of the two-party system in the United States have been realized in the actual operation of the varieties of competitive party politics existent. It would follow that some of the general conclusions reached here on the *relative* inadequacies of Louisiana's bifactionalism are tentative and subject to re-evaluation subsequent to further analyses of the politics of two-party states.

---

* This paper constitutes a section from a larger work on recent Louisiana politics currently under preparation by the writer.

[1] V. O. Key, Jr., *Southern Politics in State and Nation* (New York, 1949), has been of considerable methodological and substantive value to the writer in this study. Although the analysis here in part disagrees with some of Key's findings on Louisiana (and corroborates some of his findings also), this paper aims generally at extending the analysis of Louisiana bifactionalism deeper and further than Key's broader concern with many Southern states permitted him to do.

I. THE STRUCTURE AND MEANING OF LOUISIANA'S BIFACTIONAL RIVALRY

The structure and meaning of recent factional politics in Louisiana owes much, but not all, to the commanding figure of Huey Long. At least two aspects of pre-Long politics deserve particular mention. The first is the observation that while Huey Long stamped state government with the unique brand of his genius and temperament, he rose to office and grasped power within the Louisiana tradition of latent class conflict. Nineteenth-century Louisiana witnessed the development of class antagonisms which, however muted by the ignorance of poorer whites, the popular acceptance of the planters' creed, and the imperative of racial unity, clearly were observable during the political crises of secession and Populism.[2] Viewed in historical perspective, Longism represented the third major attempt of the rural "have-nots" to challenge the supreme alliance of rural planters and urban business and upper-class interests.

Pre-Long politics also evidenced a considerable degree of organization as well as the development of the materials for bifactional conflict. The controlling force in state politics before the entry of the Kingfish (Huey's self-styled sobriquet) was the Democratic machine of New Orleans, more familiarly known as the "Ring," the "Choctaws," or, after a factional tiff in the early 1920's, the "Old Regulars." The prominence of Orleans in state politics was the natural product of its number of voters (about 20 per cent of Louisiana's people lived in New Orleans and usually the city's share of the total vote cast in the various statewide elections was considerably higher than that proportion) and of the size of its delegations to the General Assembly and the Democratic State Central Committee (Orleans was apportioned its fair share of seats in both of those representative bodies; the smaller urban areas of the state were discriminated against). The dominance of Orleans in state politics, however, was a consequence of the city's dependence upon and vulnerability to the actions of the governor and the state legislature. In the absence of constitutional home rule provisions, the first line of self-defense for the Choctaws lay in the election of and the maintenance of friendly relations with non-hostile state officers and legislators. However reluctantly propelled into the arena of state politics, the Ring injected elements of durable organization into the factional process and directed its efforts at both the city and the state level to the promotion of conservative interests. Businessmen were the city allies of the Ring; Delta planters and varied courthouse groupings were its state allies. Choctaw rule thus continued the pattern of upper-class control of politics. In the running battle between city and country the Ring emerged most frequently as victor, but its control of public policy helped to create the reservoir of intense dissatisfaction which Huey Long tapped in his rise to power and which ultimately brought about the humbling of the city machine itself in 1935 and again in 1950.

---

[2] See R. W. Shugg, *Origins of Class Struggle in Louisiana, 1840–1875* (Baton Rouge, 1939), for an able interpretation and documentation of this theme.

To Huey Long, though, must go the lion's share of the credit for the pervasiveness, durability, and substantive meaning of recent Louisiana bifactionalism. The easy characterization of Long as "just another Southern demagogue" obscures far more than it clarifies. Unlike Bilbo or Ben Tillman, Tom Watson or Talmadge, Huey Long did not indulge in "nigger-baiting," nor did he stoop to echo Tom-Tom Heflin's diatribes against the Pope. With reference to the resentments and frustrations of their class backing, all Southern demagogues performed at least—but many at most—a cathartic function. Pappy O'Daniel and Gene Talmadge posed as neo-Populist rebels only to effectuate opposite policies. Talmadge jettisoned the New Deal because it went too far; Long ostensibly because it did not go far enough. Nor did the man who dangled the lure of Share-Our-Wealth before a depression-panicked national audience change his colors, chameleon-like, when in his home state of Louisiana. The brazen political dictatorship which Huey constructed and ran should not hide his substantial accomplishment of keeping some of his promises of lower-class benefits. The Kingfish was a free-spending, heavy-taxing, direct actionist, who had little in common with the other Southern leaders with whom he is so frequently linked.

That Huey Long did more than merely bait the corporations and the urban areas, the "better elements" and the professional politicians, marked him as a legitimate heir of the suppressed dirt-farmer movements in Louisiana history. Crushed as Populists and untouched by the urban progressivism of Wilson, the rural poorer whites found themselves voiceless until the entry of Long into politics. It is a measure of Huey's undeniable genius that he was able to arouse that rural following more intensively and durably than the Populists had done.

However marred by his lust for personal power, Long did arouse the interest and participation of masses of whites, and made them aware of the relevance of state politics to the settlement of their demands.[3] Huey captured in his state the hitherto non-voting elements which the New Deal had attracted on a national scale. Such a change in the composition of the electorate by itself heralded a different content of politics than in the pre-Long days. More crucially, Longism itself set both the form and content of that later politics. The distracting appeals of localism and personality were reduced to minimal influence as the bulk of voters affiliated themselves, in a close approximation to the two-party system, with the two major factions, Long and anti-Long. Candidates for state offices and many of the candidates for Congress and for parish and local offices publicly proclaimed their loyalty to one or the other faction. Factional lines within the state legislature became firmly drawn; when combined with the customary majority support for the incumbent administration, this gave to Louisiana governors a control over legislation not equalled in most other Southern states. Huey's heavy-handed injection of realism into the content of state politics was carried forward by brother Earl (and to a far lesser extent by son Russell), so that the Long forces gained a continuity of headship normally denied to personal factions.

---

[3] For statistical verification of this fact consult Key, *Southern Politics*, pp. 523–24.

Longism thus was no flashing meteor of Populism, brilliant but transient. It aroused the politically quiescent have-nots and showed them unforgettably the total victory that was theirs for the balloting. It unified the fragments of politics—expectations, candidates, institutions—by means of one deeply-felt adherence, pro- or anti-Longism. It came closer to the salient issues of the day than had a raft of "good government" predecessors of Huey. The policy impact of Longism was strikingly attested to in the state office campaign of 1940, when the anti-Longs, despite the involvement of the Longites in the corruption of the "Scandals," saw fit to pledge liberal measures which, in toto, made Huey's performance eight years earlier appear conservative. After Huey was assassinated in 1935, to thousands of Louisiana voters the available political alternatives continued to be cast in the simple mold of "do-something" versus "do-nothing," "the people" versus "the interests." The persistence of the emotional loyalties and issues created by the Kingfish accounts in large part for the content and form of post-Huey politics in Louisiana.

II. BIFACTIONAL LOYALTIES OF THE VOTERS

The sound and fury of Longite politics had sufficient substantive meaning to provide Louisiana with a well-organized politics of rational interest-voting. Huey's program and performance vitalized state politics and created a conscious, persistent bifactionalism. The voting strength of the two major factions came from distinct groups, each of which displayed a continuity of political attitudes going back to the muted class conflicts of the previous century. The basic cleavages among the voters appeared to be closely related to the antagonisms between city and rural dwellers and to those between dirt farmers and wealthier planters.

The centers of Longite and anti-Long strength may be uncovered by summarizing the results of a quartile ranking of the vote in the 64 parishes of the state in the gubernatorial primaries (where bifactionalism is sharpest and turnout greatest) from 1928 through 1952. About 50 parishes may be classified as usually pro- or anti-Long in voting behavior. The Longite sections comprised the cut-over uplands of northern and west-central Louisiana and the eastern portion of the state known as the "Florida parishes," populated by relatively few Negroes and by many poorer white farmers. In addition, sparsely settled Cameron parish in the southwestern tip of the state and the bossed parishes of Plaquemines and St. Bernard in the southeast nearly always have supported Long candidates. Several of the sugar-growing parishes in south Louisiana also have backed the Longs, although not as intensively as the upland regions. The rural class support accorded the Longs may be observed most clearly in those parishes which contained both plantation and hill-farming lands. In both the upper Mississippi and Red River deltas, pro-Longism increased as the fertility of the soil decreased. In the northeast delta parishes, the influx of white farmers from neighboring states converted East Carroll and Concordia parishes to support of Long and diluted the anti-Long performance of Madison and Tensas. The political success of Longism thus lay in its ability to capture and reinforce the allegiance of those rural groups which twice before had embarked vainly upon a politics of protest.

The core areas of persistent anti-Long sentiment encompassed the major urban parishes,[4] the plantation areas of the upper Mississippi and Red River deltas, West and East Feliciana, and most of the Sugar Bowl parishes. That even small-scale urbanism and anti-Longism went hand in hand may be shown by an examination of the voting behavior of wards containing the parish seats in 53 of the state's 64 parishes.[5] Conservative urbanites thus were the allies of planters and well-to-do farmers in common opposition to Longism, a combination of political forces which continued the pattern of nineteenth-century politics.

TABLE I. THE PERSISTENCE OF ANTI-LONGISM IN LESSER URBAN AREAS: QUARTILE POSITION OF SUPPORT OF LONGISM OF FIFTY-THREE URBAN WARDS CONTAINING PARISH SEATS AMONG ALL WARDS OF THE STATE, IN SELECTED PRIMARY ELECTIONS, 1928–1952

Longite Candidate and Primary Election	Quartile Position			
	Highest	2nd	3rd	Lowest
Huey Long, 1928, Gov.	1	9	27	16
Earl Long, 1940, Gov., 2nd	4	8	19	22
Earl Long, 1944, Lt. Gov., 2nd	2	7	20	24
Russell Long, 1948, Sen.	3	4	13	33
Carlos Spaht, 1952, Gov., 2nd	6	10	17	20

Source: computed from *Compilation of Primary Election Returns of the Democratic Party, State of Louisiana,* issued by the Secretary of State, for the 1928, 1940, 1944, and 1952 elections, and from unpublished election data on file at the office of the Secretary of State of Louisiana for the 1948 election.

The general pattern of urban antipathy to Longism should not obscure the fact that two urban groups, organized labor and the Negro, have tended to be pro-Long. Labor's claims of political power, however, contained more boast than reality, while Negro voters, a new force in Louisiana politics, were loyal to the pursuit of certain group objectives rather than to the Long faction itself. The past Longite sympathies of neither group, therefore, guarantee an upsurge in Longite strength as urbanization, industrialization, and Negro voting increase.

---

[4] Key, p. 178, cites Calcasieu parish, containing Lake Charles, as an apparent exception to the urban pattern of anti-Longism. An examination of the ward data, however, eliminates the exception. Ward 3 of Calcasieu, in which Lake Charles is located, fell in the third quartile (quarter) of support for Huey Long in 1928 and for Longite candidate Spaht in 1952, and in the fourth (lowest) quartile of support for Earl Long in the 1940 and 1944 runoff primaries and for Russell Long in the 1948 senatorial primary.

[5] The major urban parishes of Orleans, East Baton Rouge, Caddo, and Jefferson and the bossed parishes of Plaquemines and St. Bernard have been omitted. In addition, the seats of the following parishes were not incorporated areas and therefore were omitted: St. Charles, St. James, St. John, Cameron, and Livingston.

III. PERSONAL FOLLOWINGS AND BIFACTIONALISM

Bifactional politics, to approach the organizational influence of a party system, should tend to discourage personal and localistic candidacies for governor which are unrelated to the state's political dualism. Certainly there ought not to be room in Louisiana's bipolarized factionalism to permit an allegedly "personal" leader to deliver his allegedly "personal" following to the support of the gubernatorial candidate of his choice in the runoff primary. Yet experienced Louisiana politicians do compete for the backing of one or more of the lesser leaders who are eliminated in the first gubernatorial primary. And V. O. Key has concluded that " . . . some [Louisiana] leaders have a following that can, at least at times, be voted fairly solidly for another candidate."[6] The question of the existence of transferable personal followings deserves the fullest exploration because of its crucial implications for the inadequacy of the one-party bifactional system.

The runoff primary in the state campaign of 1940 affords a convenient starting point for analysis, since Key's conclusion was based upon an examination of that election. The 1940 state contest was conducted in the shadow of the Scandals, an unsavory episode in Louisiana politics which exposed many of Huey's successors as being too prone to share the people's wealth. The gubernatorial candidate of the Long organization, which was being buffeted by federal and state investigations and prosecutions, was Earl K. Long. James A. Noe, a Huey Longite on the outs with Huey's heirs since 1935, and instrumental in uncovering wholesale corruption in high places in 1939, appealed to the pro-Long elements disgusted by the Scandals. The entrant of the reform anti-Long forces was Sam H. Jones, while the fourth serious candidacy was that of James H. Morrison, a political newcomer with some localized strength in the eastern Florida parishes, who ran on an anti-Long platform. Long (226,385 votes) and Jones (154,936) made the runoff, and in the interim between primaries Noe (116,564) declared his support of and actively stumped for Jones. In the second primary Jones defeated Long, 284,437 to 265,403 votes.

The runoff primary distribution of Noe's first primary vote may be gauged by isolating those wards in which Noe received more than 30 per cent of the first primary vote and Morrison and Moseley (a fifth non-serious candidate) together received less than 3 per cent of that vote. Twenty-eight wards from 16 parishes, located largely in north Louisiana, the section of Noe's greatest support, meet the standards indicated. Nearly all the wards were strong pro-Long districts; 25 of the 28 supported Huey's bid for the United States Senate by more than 60 per cent of the ward vote back in 1930. In addition, each of the wards listed in Table II cast more than 200 votes in the 1940 first gubernatorial primary.

---

[6] Key, p. 173.

On the reasonable assumption that a minimal number of Long and Jones supporters changed their votes in the second primary, a reading of the mean figures in the foregoing table leads to the conclusion that about 73 per cent of Noe's following transferred their votes to Jones in the runoff, and the pro-

TABLE II. THE TRANSFERABILITY OF PERSONAL FOLLOWINGS: THE DISTRIBUTION OF NOE'S FIRST PRIMARY VOTE TO LONG AND JONES IN THE SECOND PRIMARY, 1940, FOR SELECTED WARDS

Parish	Ward	Noe's % of First Primary Vote	Increased % of Ward Vote in Runoff over First Primary (% Vote in Runoff Minus % Vote in First Primary)	
			Earl Long	Sam Jones
Caldwell	8	59.3%	24.3%	36.4%
Catahoula	3	51.7	24.5	29.5
Jackson	5	50.5	17.2	36.0
Evangeline	5	48.0	11.0	38.1
Jefferson	6	46.2	6.3	40.7
Avoyelles	5	45.6	11.6	36.0
Winn	10	45.2	16.6	30.2
Grant	8	43.4	11.9	33.7
Webster	1	42.9	20.0	23.6
Rapides	10	40.1	8.6	34.2
West Carroll	5	39.9	12.0	30.2
Winn	8	39.4	1.6	39.4
Avoyelles	1	38.8	12.2	27.3
Bienville	7	37.7	12.5	27.5
Jackson	1	37.5	7.5	32.8
Evangeline	1	37.4	5.7	32.9
Allen	3	37.3	11.3	27.4
West Carroll	4	36.2	9.3	29.5
Beauregard	5	35.4	11.6	25.7
Avoyelles	4	34.7	10.0	25.7
West Carroll	1	34.1	8.0	27.8
Winn	9	33.9	6.8	28.4
Rapides	5	33.3	10.8	23.8
Morehouse	10	32.8	7.6	27.7
Avoyelles	7	32.3	5.1	29.0
Red River	7	30.8	11.8	21.8
Grant	3	30.7	4.4	28.4
Rapides	11	30.3	12.6	18.8
Mean		39.5%	11.2%	30.1%

Source: computed from *Compilation of Primary Election Returns of the Democratic Party, State of Louisiana,* issued by the Secretary of State, for the 1940 gubernatorial election.

Jones direction of the vote was common to each ward analyzed. Before conclusions on the existence and deliverability of personal factions may be reached, however, it must first be ascertained whether the Noe voters, most of whom were Longites in previous elections, supported Jones because of Noe's leadership or for some other reason.[7] An analysis of the runoff distribution of Morrison's first primary vote (48,243) throws considerable light on that problem. Table III includes all wards which gave Morrison more than 40 per cent and Noe and Moseley combined less than 6 per cent of the vote cast in the first primary of 1940. Of the 15 wards, located in eight parishes, all but one gave Huey Long more than 60 per cent of the ward vote cast in the senatorial campaign of 1930. In Table III, as in the previous table, all wards chosen cast over 200 votes in the first primary.

TABLE III. THE TRANSFERABILITY OF PERSONAL FOLLOWINGS: THE DISTRIBUTION OF MORRISON'S FIRST PRIMARY VOTE TO LONG AND JONES IN THE SECOND PRIMARY, 1940, FOR SELECTED WARDS

Parish	Ward	Morrison's % of First Primary Vote	Increased % of Ward Vote in Runoff over First Primary (% Vote in Runoff Minus % Vote in First Primary)	
			Earl Long	Sam Jones
Ascension	10	62.6%	19.4%	48.6%
St. James	8	60.2	20.8	40.8
St. James	1	60.0	14.9	49.0
Livingston	6	56.8	19.5	43.2
St. James	2	55.6	19.0	40.8
Pointe Coupee	5	50.2	1.1	53.8
Pointe Coupee	7	49.5	7.4	44.9
St. James	9	47.8	17.0	34.1
Lafourche	6	47.1	11.8	39.3
St. Charles	4	44.1	16.2	33.8
St. John	4	43.7	11.8	37.7
Terrebonne	7	43.6	9.8	37.9
St. Charles	2	43.5	13.0	36.4
Terrebonne	5	42.4	7.0	39.2
St. John	5	42.2	13.4	33.0
Mean		50.0%	13.5%	40.8%

Source: computed from *Compilation of Primary Election Returns of the Democratic Party, State of Louisiana*, issued by the Secretary of State, for the 1940 gubernatorial election.

Campaigning on an anti-Long platform, Morrison secured the support of many voters in the Florida parishes and neighboring areas who had been

---

[7] Using parish voting data and a somewhat different statistical technique, Key, pp. 174–75, also concluded that Jones secured the bulk of Noe's first primary vote. Key's mistaken inference from that finding came from failing to probe further in the manner undertaken in the text above.

Longites in 1930. These presumably represented the same sort of following as Noe's. In sharp contrast to Noe, Morrison neither urged support of nor stumped for Jones, and indeed even implied a personal preference for Earl Long after the first primary. Nonetheless, as judged by the mean figures, about 75 per cent of Morrison's vote went to Jones in the runoff, a proportion roughly the same as that determined for the Noe supporters, and the Morrison vote in each of the wards studied went in the same factional direction in the runoff.

Although the analysis of the distribution of Morrison's vote does not eliminate the possibility that Noe had a transferable personal following, it does render questionable any positive conclusions on the deliverability of Noe's voters when based solely on the data on Noe. In the light of recent Louisiana politics, it seems to this writer more reasonable to conclude that Noe had no personal following to deliver. There was nothing in his brief political career as state senator and acting governor which would account for the large country parish organization of over 100,000 votes imputed to his personal leadership. Another explanation of Noe's role in the 1940 primaries may be suggested. He was less the personal leader of a devoted following than the temporary product of transitory circumstance. His was the voice of those Longites outraged by the Long organization's betrayal of Huey and consequently hostile to Earl's candidacy. Their customary antipathy to an anti-Long candidate was muted by Jones's reiteration that his "pappy was for Huey" and by his pledge to retain and expand liberal governmental benefits. Under such conditions the majority of those who voted for Noe naturally gravitated to Jones; a better test of Noe's alleged factional headship would have occurred had he endorsed Earl Long for the runoff primary.

Another opportunity to test the proposition that some Louisiana politicians are able to control the votes of a deliverable personal following is offered by the events of the gubernatorial runoff primary of 1944, in which the reform candidate, James H. Davis, defeated Longite Lewis Morgan. Dudley LeBlanc, an opportunistic south Louisiana politico, had run unsuccessfully on an anti-Jones plank in the first primary, securing 40,392 votes concentrated, in a "friends and neighbors" fashion, in several Cajun parishes. Before the second primary LeBlanc reversed his factional affiliation and came out for Davis. A satisfactory measurement of LeBlanc's influence may be had by noting the first and runoff primary figures for Davis and Morgan in the four parishes in which LeBlanc garnered roughly half the first primary vote. All of the first primary votes for candidates other than LeBlanc, Davis, or Morgan are credited to Morgan for the runoff, thus giving LeBlanc every chance to prove possession of a deliverable following. (For example, eight per cent of Acadia's first primary vote went to candidates other than the three indicated. That eight per cent will be subtracted from Morgan's net increase in the second primary on the arbitrary assumption that all those who voted for other candidates in the first primary subsequently voted for Morgan. This deliberate error, which credits LeBlanc for all of Davis' increased votes, has the virtue of isolating the LeBlanc vote.)

TABLE IV. THE TRANSFERABILITY OF PERSONAL FOLLOWINGS: THE DISTRIBUTION OF LEBLANC'S FIRST PRIMARY VOTE TO DAVIS AND MORGAN IN THE SECOND PRIMARY, 1944, FOR SELECTED PARISHES

Parish	LeBlanc % of First Primary Vote	Increased % of Parish Vote in Runoff over First Primary (% Vote in Runoff Minus % Vote in First Primary)	
		James Davis	Lewis Morgan
Acadia	55.7%	30.4%	25.3%
Evangeline	48.3	34.8	13.5
Lafayette	47.3	23.6	23.7
Vermilion	58.6	29.3	29.3
Mean	52.5%	29.5%	23.0%

Source: computed from *Compilation of Primary Election Returns of the Democratic Party, State of Louisiana*, issued by the Secretary of State, for the 1944 gubernatorial election.

As determined by the mean performance under the favorable statistical method here employed, Davis secured about 56 per cent of LeBlanc's votes. On a statewide basis, Davis attracted 53.6 per cent of the total vote. Although Dudley LeBlanc, reputed King of the Cajuns, performed better than Morrison had in 1940, he obviously had no deliverable following of any magnitude in 1944.

The 1948 gubernatorial campaign, in which Earl Long trounced Sam Jones, provides a third and final test of the existence of transferable personal followings. James H. Morrison and Robert Kennon were the two candidates eliminated in the first primary. Morrison, who campaigned as a Longite, urged support for the reform candidate, Jones, in the interim between primaries. The distribution of Morrison's vote in the runoff may be determined by the usual method, in this case employing all wards in which the Kennon vote was less than 5 per cent and the Morrison vote more than 30 per cent in the first primary, and in which more than 200 votes were cast. Eighteen wards from eight parishes meet those standards. It might also be noted that 13 of those wards had given Earl Long more than 50 per cent of the ward vote in his failing bid for the lieutenant governorship in the 1944 runoff primary. In spite of Morrison's open support of Jones, as judged by the mean figures in Table V, about 82 per cent of Morrison's first primary vote went to Earl Long.[8] The

---

[8] Key, p. 174, footnote 34, noted James H. Morrison's inability to deliver his following, but implied that the exception of Morrison helped prove the general rule of transferable followings by resorting to the following speculation: " . . . Morrison's 1948 vote consisted in considerable measure, not of his own following, but of support from the New Orleans 'Old Regular' organization, which further analysis would probably show was able in the second primary to deliver its vote against Jones, the ally of deLesseps Morrison, mayor of New Orleans and foe of the 'Old Regulars'." While the Orleans vote for Morrison behaved in the second primary as Key predicted, the fact remains that two-thirds of Mor-

Longite direction of Morrison's vote held constant for each of the wards examined.

The degree of deliverability of a personal following in recent Louisiana politics has been subjected to three tests: anti-Jones LeBlanc (1944) and Longite Morrison (1948) could not commit their first primary supporters to anti-Longism, while defecting Longite Noe (1940) merely activated defecting Longite voters in a natural anti-Long direction. The bifactionalism bequeathed by Huey Long to the state of Louisiana is too pervading to permit the existence of many purely personal followings. While the open Democratic procedures of the

TABLE V. THE TRANSFERABILITY OF PERSONAL FOLLOWINGS: THE DISTRIBUTION OF MORRISON'S FIRST PRIMARY VOTE TO LONG AND JONES IN THE SECOND PRIMARY, 1948, FOR SELECTED WARDS

Parish	Ward	Morrison's % of First Primary Vote	Increased % of Ward Vote in Runoff over First Primary (% Vote in Runoff Minus % Vote in First Primary)	
			Earl Long	Sam Jones
Livingston	5	82.1%	66.8%	16.1%
Ascension	10	74.0	54.3	22.5
Livingston	6	72.3	61.0	15.3
Livingston	10	71.4	65.2	8.5
Tangipahoa	6	70.5	58.7	15.8
Livingston	3	70.2	60.8	12.9
Livingston	4	68.7	61.2	11.6
Tangipahoa	8	61.0	54.5	10.0
Iberville	8	60.7	58.5	7.1
Lafourche	6	58.6	46.1	14.6
St. Tammany	6	58.6	49.6	12.2
Livingston	8	58.0	44.2	18.7
Tangipahoa	5	56.4	51.0	10.1
St. John	6	54.5	53.6	5.2
Iberville	5	46.1	37.1	13.2
Ascension	2	31.1	34.7	1.2
Ascension	1	30.7	30.2	3.7
St. James	8	30.1	30.8	2.8
Mean		58.6%	51.0%	11.2%

Source: computed from *Compilation of Primary Election Returns of the Democratic Party, State of Louisiana,* issued by the Secretary of State, for the 1948 gubernatorial election.

---

rison's vote (68,502 of 101,754 votes) came from parishes other than Orleans. It should be noted that Table V consists entirely of non-Orleans wards, the voting behavior of which provided the finding that Morrison's first primary vote was distributed four-to-one for Earl Long in the runoff. Because of the dominant influence of the Old Regulars in city politics, no wards from New Orleans have been included in any of the tables in this paper.

first primary invite the entrance of candidates other than the leaders of the two major factions, and "native-son" voting is not uncommon in the first primary, such candidacies are offered always with reference to bifactional politics: e.g., Noe ran on an anti-Long plank, Morrison as a Longite, and LeBlanc on an anti-Jones platform. Such third candidacies are those of competing Longite and anti-Long leaders, each of whom commands some local following in support of his personal and *factional* candidacy, a candidacy which represents persistent issues and attitudes over and above the attraction of personality. Indeed the phrase "third candidacies" is quite misleading, for the purpose of the first primary is precisely to determine which of the rival factional leaders commands majority allegiance within each of the two major factions. It should not be overlooked that Louisiana's first gubernatorial Democratic primary apparently produces leaders of two opposing political groups no less regularly than do the party primaries in two-party states.

What are the comparative strengths of the competing pulls of personality and faction? In common with a two-party system, Louisiana's bifactionalism permits some play for personal loyalties, e.g., Morrison is assured of some votes on a "friends and neighbors" basis regardless of whether he supports either or neither of the dominant factions. Such a truly personal following is, however, of minimal proportions because of the greater concern with faction. Thus Morrison could not expect to attract anything like the same sources of localistic (Florida parishes) support in the same degree irrespective of whether he allied himself with or against the Longites. When Morrison is pro-Long, many pro-Long voters in the Florida parishes will go along with native-son Morrison in the first primary rather than with a rival Longite candidate from another part of the state; proportionately much fewer of the anti-Longs in the region will do so. Loyalty to the person of Morrison, far from being unconditional and blind, is conditional upon a more basic commitment to the factional system itself. Morrison's supporters, in 1940 and in 1948, consonant with their primary allegiance to faction, moved consistently in the same factional direction in the first and second primary in bland disregard of the opposite factional tack taken by their "personal leader." Noe, in 1940, by asking his supporters to vote in the second primary for the candidate most of them were going to support anyway, merely created the illusion of a following both personal and deliverable. However, LeBlanc's performance in 1944 deviated somewhat from this pattern, thereby implying that his was a more likely example of personal leadership than that of Morrison or Noe. But, in contradiction to LeBlanc's unifactional endorsement in the runoff primary, his first primary supporters split almost evenly for both factions.

The practical conclusions for state politicians are obvious: neither Noe nor Morrison had true personal followings at all, and LeBlanc had but limited influence over his Cajun supporters.[9] There would be considerably less clamor in Louisiana about the frequency and evil of second primary "sell-outs" if it were realized clearly that no leader to date had anything much to sell. The broader implication of the foregoing analyses is also clear: the fact that the run-off primary influence of the losing candidate in the first primary is overshadowed by the orientation of his followers towards the bifactional system supports Louisiana's claim to possession of something like a two-party system.

---

[9] It would be relevant to note that reputed "personal leadership" virtually vanishes when the leader himself is not a candidate: e.g., in the 1952 first gubernatorial primary, while non-candidate James Morrison stumped for reform candidate Hale Boggs, the Florida parishes went overwhelmingly for reform candidate Robert Kennon.

IV. THE OPERATION OF THE TICKET SYSTEM

Extensive employment by the major factions of the "ticket system," Louisiana's equivalent of party slates, together with a cohesive bifactionalism and the dominance of the governor in state politics, comprise the three distinctive traits of Louisiana's Democracy as contrasted with the rest of the one-party South. All three characteristics are interdependent, and have been interacting to create a facsimile of a smoothly operating two-party system. Louisiana governors, for example, possessed no unique formal powers, yet, unlike many other Southern governors, they usually were undisputed masters of both the bureaucracy and the legislature. The explanation lies in the Longite development of a disciplined bifactional politics and in the Longite intensification of the use of the ticket system in state and parish politics. The pervasiveness of the ticket system preserves the logical structure of bifactionalism for the voter and provides some of the cement of factional unity underlying legislative and administrative cooperation with the governor. Joint factional candidacies have been the rule in recent Louisiana state politics; every candidate is not for himself alone. At the state office level, serious contenders for the nine elective posts affiliate with one or more of several state slates, campaign together, and present their candidacies as a ticket unit to the electorate. Many of the candidates for state legislative posts and for parish offices see fit to align themselves publicly (and many more privately) with a state ticket and, on occasion, state bifactionalism penetrates to the ward level of police jury contests.[10] A detailed analysis of the Louisiana ticket system, therefore, should illuminate the factional base of gubernatorial power and provide some answers to the question of how closely bifactionalism approaches the workings of a two-party system.[11]

The State Ticket System. The practice of state office candidates campaigning jointly on public slates antedated Huey Long, and most probably originated in the early days of the Choctaws, who created the state ticket they supported and forced their opponents to adopt some sort of counter-slate. Many potential candidates for state offices sounded out the Orleans city machine before deciding whether or not to run, and the Choctaws created the equivalent of a state ticket by their endorsements of candidates for each state office. Before the Kingfish, however, ticket campaigning and ticket voting were confined largely to the Orleans area. The 1932 state primary marked the first time that a full state ticket campaigned as a unit in the country parishes, i.e., outside of New Orleans. Since 1932, all major candidates for state office have run on state tickets.

---

[10] A police jury is the governing body of a Louisiana parish (county).

[11] The analysis is based, for the most part, on an extensive questionnaire, interview, and research project on the ticket aspects of the 1948 and 1952 gubernatorial primaries undertaken by the writer.

The utility of the ticket device to the parties concerned is clear. From the point of view of the gubernatorial candidate, a state ticket offers him the opportunity of broadening his appeal to all sections of the state through the skillful creation of a "balanced" slate which adequately recognizes the politically-relevant diversity within the state, e.g., the customary running mate of a north Louisiana Protestant gubernatorial candidate is a south Louisiana Catholic for lieutenant governor. From the perspective of a lesser ticket member, no matter how large he believes his personal following to be, an alliance with a major faction provides him with the statewide organization indispensable to a serious candidacy. It is not uncommon, however, for some state tickets to be "bob-tailed," i.e., not to include an affiliated candidate for every one of the nine statewide offices, and for some to include candidates for lesser state office who are also endorsed by another rival ticket. For all the participants on a ticket its core value is monetary: each candidate secures the benefit of a fully-organized campaign at cut-rate prices.

A state ticket is in reality a gubernatorial ticket, since the candidate for governor both heads and dominates it. It is an "Earl Long ticket" or a "Sam Jones ticket" that is presented to the voters. The affiliated candidates devote much of their oratory on the stump to urging support for their gubernatorial ally and for the full ticket, and often have little of substance to say on their own behalf. The latter situation is particularly true for certain of the elective posts: e.g., what can candidates for Auditor, Treasurer, and Register of the State Land Office publicly pledge by way of dramatic, winning appeal? A frequent complaint of Louisianians is that the ticket organization of candidacies at times allows the poorly qualified to secure office on the coattails of the governor, but that defect is more than counterbalanced by the heightened possibility of a rational politics through use of the ticket device.

The degree to which the state ticket system injects order into one-party politics is ultimately a function of the behavior of individual voters. In Key's informed judgment, "In Louisiana . . . the voters mark a straight ticket about as consistently as they do at a general election in a two-party state."[12] Ticket voting is, naturally, strongest in the runoff primary when the number of factional slates is reduced to two, and is considerably weaker in the more bewildering melee of the first primary.

Generally, the chances of success are slim for an "independent" candidate without a place on a major state ticket. On the other hand, affiliation with a losing ticket sometimes may be overcome, particularly by long-time incumbents of lesser state posts running for re-nomination who have personal friendships over the state, e.g., Harry Wilson as Commissioner of Agriculture, T. H. Harris as Superintendent of Education, Lucille May Grace as Register of the Land Office, L. B. Baynard as Auditor, and A. P. Tugwell as Treasurer.

---

[12] Key, p. 170.

However, these "personal followings" provide no exception to the previous analysis of deliverable followings, for they are non-transferable and, moreover, evaporate when the veteran incumbent ambitiously seeks the highest state office. For example, Miss Grace, running for governor in 1952, polled 4,832 votes. Continued re-election to lesser state office has not been the route to the Executive Mansion. Hence the system of state tickets dominated by gubernatorial candidates provides some basis for post-election gubernatorial control over the elective department heads.

Affiliation with a State Ticket by Local Candidates. The issues of tremendous popular concern put forward by Longism, together with the deep penetration of state politics as practiced by the Kingfish, argued for a non-divorcement of local politics from state bifactionalism. A provision of the state primary election law encouraged state tickets and local candidates to enter some sort of working agreement to insure adequate poll-commissioner representation for each. Under that provision only candidates for local offices could submit the names of poll commissioners and watchers for the first primary; their selection for the second primary was controlled by both the gubernatorial and the local candidates participating in the runoff.[13] Affiliation with a state ticket by a local candidate satisfied the former's need for grass roots organization and enabled the latter to meet more easily the financial costs of campaigning. Such utilitarian pressures appear to be at the heart of the extension of the state ticket into parish politics.

There seems to be a sectional pattern to the practice of parish candidate alliance with a state ticket. Public affiliations are confined largely to Catholic south Louisiana, where high rates of illiteracy enhance the strategic role of poll commissioners and where politics is so highly organized that running for parish and ward offices on local tickets is traditional.[14] In north Louisiana the tie-ups between local candidates and a state faction, though not uncommon, are less frequently publicized.[15] Like the consumption of liquor, perhaps, the action is concluded behind barn doors. Factional leanings of local candidates are often known anyway, particularly in those parishes whose bifactional preferences have been quite definite. For example, in the "independent" parish of Caddo, which contains Shreveport, the majority of legislative candidates in the 1952 primaries were "known" to be anti-Long although there were no local tickets and only one local candidate publicly affiliated himself with a state ticket.[16] The situation is the same in Longite strongholds, for example, Red River parish, about which an informant related, "A majority of the local candidates are Long supporters, but with few exceptions, none have been backed by a state ticket." In most cases the factional preferences of local candidates are common knowledge, at least to the political insiders if not to the public at large, a conclusion attested to by the following replies to the writer's questionnaires with regard to the 1948 and 1952 state office primaries sent to selected parish officials.

---

[13] *Revised Statutes of Louisiana, 1950*, Title 18, Chapter 2, Sections 340, 357, 358. Poll commissioners were particularly useful to candidates because they were entitled to assist illiterate voters (now forbidden by Act 309 of 1952) and physically disabled voters in the polling booth. The system forced gubernatorial candidates, in order to secure fair representation of election-day personnel in the first primary, to make overtures to local candidates who controlled the selection of such personnel. The significance of this power may be gauged by the following form letter issued under the name of Earl Long and dated January . . . , 1940: "Dear Mr. . . . . . : I am glad to note that you were drawn as an Election Commissioner. I am sure that you realize the heavy responsibility that rests on your shoulders. Anything that you can do to see that I get a square deal in this election will be appreciated and remembered. If I can render you any assistance, do not hesitate to call on me."—Wisdom Collection of Long Materials, Howard Tilton Memorial Library, Tulane University, New Orleans.

[14] Most, though not all, of the parishes in which legislative candidates aligned with a state ticket in 1952 had a firm tradition of local tickets. The sheriff usually heads a local ticket, and its rationale again lies in the practical benefits accruing to each of the participants.

[15] The author's data indicate some exceptions: Union, Catahoula, Rapides, St. Helena, and Livingston parishes had both public local tickets and open local candidate alignment in either or both 1948 and 1952.

> *East Feliciana, 1948.* "There were no public alignments of local candidates with state factions. . . . Of course, several candidates were known to have belonged to certain state factions, but they all ran for office on the public theory that they were independent of factionalism."
>
> *Ouachita, 1948.* "None of the candidates were publicly aligned with state tickets or other local candidates. (We do not have local tickets.) Of course there were candidates in different races who were encouraged by local leaders of state tickets to enter respective races. This was not generally known to the public."
>
> *Tensas, 1948.* " . . . not any of the local candidates . . . were aligned with any of the State candidates. In some instances it was generally known that several of the Parish candidates were against the administration at that time, or were for the administration at that time, but they were not aligned in any manner with respect to posters, ads, or tickets."
>
> *Lincoln, 1952.* "There were numerous secret alliances but for some reason the 'local ticket' practice prevailing in many Louisiana parishes has never . . . been employed in this parish."

The clearest factional guideposts to the voter obviously are provided by the non-secret alliances between state tickets and local candidates. Several examples of forthright public endorsements of state tickets by parish office seekers may be cited.

> We, the undersigned, do hereby certify that at a caucus held in the office of the Governor, Sunday, October 13, 1935, the above-named candidates for parish and district offices [in Pointe Coupee parish] did agree and pledge themselves to support all candidates on the Long-Allen state ticket, and did further agree and pledge themselves to support each other for parish and district offices. . . .[17]

In his political advertisement as candidate for coroner, East Baton Rouge parish, in the 1944 primary, Dr. F. U. Darby stated:

> My politics are not secret. I am supporting Jimmie H. Davis for Governor and am a candidate on the Parish Ticket.[18]

---

[16] An informant related that in the 1952 runoff primary Kennon headquarters in Shreveport would suggest to the inquiring voter support of designated candidates for the state legislature none of whom had affiliated publicly with the Kennon ticket.

[17] *Pointe Coupee Banner*, Nov. 21, 1935.

[18] *Morning Advocate* (Baton Rouge), Jan. 16, 1944.

In his political advertisement for re-nomination as sheriff of Iberia parish in 1948, Gilbert Ozenne declared:

> I have endorsed the candidacy of Earl K. Long for Governor. My opponent lacks the political courage to acknowledge that he was supported and endorsed by the Sam Jones faction. I solicit the vote and support of all qualified voters regardless of political affiliations.[19]

Affiliation is a two-way affair, so gubernatorial tickets also spread the factional word.

In a political circular distributed by the Louisiana Democratic Association, Longite Governor Leche began:

> In order that the people of Louisiana may have correct information as to who bears the endorsement of the Louisiana Democratic Association in all second primaries, we the undersigned [the state ticket members] now make the statement that the following candidates for their respective (parish and local) offices have been endorsed. . . . [20]

Reform candidate Sam Jones urged publicly before the 1940 first primary:

> Wherever you have a Sam Jones candidate for either House or Senate be sure to vote for him. If it should happen that none of the candidates have endorsed me, vote for an anti-administration independent candidate. . . . [21]

Since the objective of the ticket system is to aid the candidacies of each of its co-participants, public endorsements between state tickets and local candidates tend to be delayed until after the first primary. Neither state nor parish politicians care to restrict their appeal to the following of one of many candidates or to gamble on who will make the runoff primary. These considerations are controlling in the case of wide-open parish and gubernatorial contests with a multiplicity of rivals. Conversely, pre-first primary alignments are common when one of the gubernatorial candidates seems likely to sweep the parish or when local incumbents are unopposed for re-nomination. Nevertheless, if as a general rule the state ticket affiliations of local candidates are not revealed until the interim between primaries, the commitments and arrangements between the two parties very often have been discussed, if not decided upon, before the first primary.[22]

Many informants suggested to the writer another uniformity in the variety of parish candidate links with state politics, namely, that the "in" parish administration tended to align with the "in" state administration, while challengers of the parish incumbents tended to affiliate with major anti-administration state tickets. The proposition appears logical in that the state administration over the course of four years establishes working relationships with the courthouse cliques and maintains some disciplinary powers over local officialdom for the three months following the gubernatorial primaries, such as the enforcement of state anti-gambling laws, the supervision of tax assessments, and the like. On the basis of evidence gathered by the writer, however, this political rule of thumb appears to be in error. Since the sheriff is usually the leader of the parish organization, under the suggested rule the majority of sheriffs who affiliated with a state ticket in their races for re-nomination would have supported Jones in 1948 (the incumbent governor, Davis, was of the reform faction) and Spaht, the Longite candidate, in 1952 (Earl Long was governor from 1948–1952). A computation of the data contained in replies to the writer's questionnaires contradicts that suggested pattern (see Table VI).

---

[19] *Daily Iberian* (New Iberia), Feb. 23, 1948.

[20] Political circular in Conway Scrapbook of Huey Long Materials, Vol. 7, p. 95, Louisiana State Library, Baton Rouge.

[21] *State-Times* (Baton Rouge), Jan. 12, 1940.

[22] For example, according to information received by the author in Rapides parish in the 1952 primary, Boggs, Kennon, and McLemore (all anti-Long gubernatorial candidates) jointly and secretly backed three candidates for the House. Two of them made the runoff, and then were endorsed openly by Kennon.

TABLE VI. THE PATTERN OF AFFILIATION WITH STATE TICKETS BY SHERIFFS RUNNING FOR RE-NOMINATION, 1948 AND 1952 GUBERNATORIAL FIRST AND SECOND PRIMARIES

	1948 Primary	1952 Primary
No. of parishes in which sheriff ran for re-nomination	55	52
No. of sheriffs neutral in state contest	20	33
No. of sheriffs aligned anti-Long	6	5
No. of sheriffs aligned pro-Long	29	14

In the light of the utilitarian motivations for ticket alignments, the following interpretation seems most appropriate. Most sheriffs who affiliate publicly with state factions tend to align with the Longites. This may well be a passing phenomenon, since many of the sheriffs are veteran incumbents who have ties with the stable Longite leaders going back to the 1930's, and the Longs have been known for their skillful politicking in the country parishes. The general tendency noted is subject, however, to at least two major qualifications. Parish organizations are loathe to endorse state tickets unpopular in the parish or unlikely to win statewide in the runoff primary. In the 1952 primaries, the sheriffs were subjected to conflicting pressures for alignment with the result that many refused to affiliate openly with either state faction. While the sheriffs' actions suggest some of the inadequacies of the ticket system which next deserve comment, it might be noted that local candidates in a two-party state also have been known to remain discreetly silent when faced with a national or state party ticket unpopular in their district.

Limitations of the Ticket System. The penetration of local politics by the state ticket system does not carry with it an extension of the great issues of state politics: the contests for parish office are dominated by local matters. Most local candidates, even those publicly aligned with a state faction, restrict their campaigning to local issues. Of 55 contests for sheriff in 1952 on which adequate information was compiled by the writer, 48 were characterized as revolving largely around items of local concern. As a result, straight-ticket voting from governor on down through parish clerk of court occurs only in the very highly organized or bossed parishes, and it is not unusual for voters to support at the same time a parish ticket and the state ticket it opposed. One south Louisiana sheriff informed the writer:

> The [parish] ticket supported Spaht [the Long candidate] in both primaries [1952] and carried Spaht in both primaries. However, a number of staunch supporters of the parish ticket just 'couldn't see' Spaht and voted Kennon [the reform candidate]. This had no effect on the local issue. Local voters are either for or against [us] politically, but when it comes to state tickets, they vote how they please, with no effect on the local issues. . . . Voters are entirely free to choose their state candidates. . . .

In another south Louisiana parish, "La Vieille Faction" has controlled public office for more than 25 years and uniformly has supported Longite candidates at state primaries, yet the parish did not place among those high in support of Longism from 1928–1952.[23] As a final point, while state legislative candidates campaign more in the mold of state bifactionalism, the difference is not one of kind. Of the 55 House races in 1952 on which adequate data were obtained, 33 were confined to local issues, with state ticket alignment adjudged as having little to no influence on the outcome. Campaign tie-ups between the governor and legislators, then, account only in part for the later cooperation of a large majority of the Assembly with the governor.

V. AN APPRAISAL OF LOUISIANA'S BIFACTIONALISM

Bifactionalism and the ticket system have served, with considerable effectiveness, as Louisiana's substitutes for a two-party system. Unlike several sister Southern states, Louisiana's politics has not been characterized by a chaotic multifactionalism, by a bewildering succession of transitory state factions without continuity in program, leadership, or voter loyalty. Localism and a "friends and neighbors" influence have been reduced to minimal proportions within a polarized politics of pro- and anti-Longism. The voter is offered a meaningful choice between factions embracing alternative leaders and programs, while the victorious faction normally is assured of a working control of the administrative and legislative branches by which to effectuate its pledges made to the voters. Huey Long thus gave Louisiana a structured and organized politics, a politics that made sense.

Although vastly superior to one-party confusion, Louisiana's bifactionalism is considerably inferior to two-party politics, or at least to the claims put forward on behalf of the two-party system in the United States. A summary review of some of the major divergences will document that conclusion.

Louisiana's ticket system together with its bifactionalism has been adjudged by Key to " . . . more closely approach the reality of a party system than do the factions of any other southern state."[24] It is useful to an understanding of the differences between the systems to point out that bifactionalism approached the organizational thoroughness of a two-party system only in the despotic days of the Kingdom of the Kingfish. The Louisiana ticket system as analyzed is neither cohesive nor penetrating enough to provide the basis for a permanent state factional machine on a par with stable party control—resort must be had to a control of parish governments and of election machinery and to high-handed attempts to extend factional dominance for longer than a single term of office, as indulged in by the brothers Long. The state ticket device permits no governor-oriented machine at the state level because of the hard fact that the governor, alone of the elective state officers, is not eligible for immediate re-election. On the parish level, selfish political considerations, not the friendly links between local officials and Longite leaders, determine the choice of ticket alignments. The fact that a parish organization supported Earl Long in 1940 will have some but not decisive weight in its decision whether or not to support him in 1944 or 1948. In times of stress, as in the case of Longite Spaht, who was soundly beaten in the gubernatorial contest of 1952, the hollowness of what passes for a durable Longite machine stands revealed. Courthouse groupings, therefore, provide no certain permanent local organization for any state faction, much less a solid political base comparable to the ward and precinct organization of parties. Every four years there is a wild scramble *de novo* by state tickets for parish candidate and local ticket support. The popularized notion of an Earl Long machine, therefore, does not square with the rationale and operation of the ticket system in Louisiana politics. These judgments have even greater validity for the anti-Long faction, which suffers from inability to maintain a grass roots organization in the period between quadrennial elections. Louisiana's experience raises the question of whether bifactionalism, in the absence of a functioning rival party, can ever hope to attain a quasi-party system without degenerating into factional dictatorship.

---

[23] So strong was La Vieille Faction's grip upon the parish that the quadrennial appearance of a rival slate was held to be motivated by the desire to control parish patronage in the event the anti-Longs should capture the governorship. If true, here would be a Democratic factional analogy to the role of the Louisiana Republican party prior to 1952.

[24] Key, p. 169. Key is correct in pointing out that Louisiana's bifactionalism fails to approximate, in absolute terms, a bipartisan scheme.

Apart from Huey's regime, the measure of the difference between bifactional and party schemes is the increasing fuzziness of the former as it extends beyond the arena of state office politics, as in the limitations of the ticket system already examined. No matter how lightly party attachments may be viewed, the labels in a party system give identification and some meaning to candidacies and thereby provide clarification for the voter. By contrast, Louisiana senators and congressmen often develop their own followings and are judged by the voters by standards independent of bifactionalism. For this reason senators often may "interfere" in state elections even to the point of changing, as Overton and Russell Long have done, their factional affiliation without much fear of electoral retaliation several years later. The late Senator Overton and Senator Ellender both traced their political lineage to close personal support of Huey Long, and yet, except for their original primary election, neither had serious difficulty in being returned to office. The political fortunes of Russell Long, Huey's son and Earl's nephew, illustrate the point. When running for his first political office to fill the unexpired term of the late Senator Overton in 1948, Russell campaigned entirely in the context of bifactionalism since he was exclusively identified with Longism. Russell barely won office then, and the pattern of his electoral support and opposition was clearly in the bifactional tradition of state office politics. By 1950 Russell had broader appeal by virtue of his record in the Senate, and his bid for a full Senate term was rewarded by the support of 68.5 per cent of the votes cast and of all but one of the state's 64 parishes. In similar fashion bifactional linkage to presidential politics customarily has been weak, although the electoral pattern in the 1952 presidential election bore more than a casual relationship to state bifactionalism.[25]

Notwithstanding the durability of Louisiana's two major factions, neither has established a stable and satisfactory process of recruitment of its leaders without reference to party primary battles. Years ago the Choctaws informally performed that function; the Long faction in 1932 and 1936, and the anti-Longs in 1940, also chose their standard-bearers before the first primary. But for the most part the fairly constant Longite and anti-Long groups are wooed by competing would-be leaders, as in 1944, 1948, and 1952. The determination of factional leadership by open competition in the primaries presents many serious problems, not the least of which is the frequent inability of natural allies to consolidate their forces in the brief five or six weeks following a first primary campaign in which they were railing bitterly at each other. Bandwagon pressure, by discouraging open affiliation between state and parish allies, also handicaps the effectiveness of the primary as the selector of factional leaders. For example, anti-Long parish candidates were reluctant to tie up with Jones in 1948, and many parish Longites similarly spurned alliance with Spaht in 1952. In the absence of the regularized path to leadership usually supplied by a party sytem, it has become almost traditional for Louisiana's governors and lieutenant governors to have a falling out during their term of office.

A final grave inadequacy of Louisiana's bifactionalism is that it produces less constancy on the part of factional chieftains than of the voters. Factional defection is not limited to politicians in control of their local bailiwicks, such as Leander Perez, veteran Longite boss of Plaquemines parish, who deserted the Longs in 1948 because of their coolness to the States' Rights movement. Major political figures like Noe, James Morrison, Overton, and LeBlanc have been on all sides of the factional fence. The cross-factional support accorded the gubernatorial candidacy of Hale Boggs in the 1952 primary rarely would be duplicated in a two-party setting: reform leaders ex-Governor Jones and Mayor Morrison of New Orleans, former Longites, though not (then or now) anti-Longs, Senator Russell Long and ex-Senator William Feazel, and sometime Longite Congressman James Morrison. Here again the very lack of party labels, i.e., of identification with and responsibility to a going political organization, makes loyalty to faction less rigid and demanding than loyalty to party.[26]

---

[25] For a full analysis, see Rudolf Heberle and Perry H. Howard, "An Ecological Analysis of Political Tendencies in Louisiana: The Presidential Elections of 1952," *Social Forces*, Vol. 32, pp. 344–50 (May, 1954).

A concluding word about the future of Louisiana politics may not be inappropriate. If Huey Long's class revolution of 1928 has run its course and therefore, as Boggs and Russell Long opined in 1952, "the time has come to forgive and forget old factional bitterness," then the basic task of Louisiana voters, that of identifying the Democratic rascals who should be unseated, will become increasingly difficult in the future. However defective, Louisiana's bifactionalism has injected clarity and order into the confusion of one-party politics. The gradual disappearance of that structuring influence should be looked upon with something less than optimism. For while it is certainly true that the stubborn factional cleavage within the state's Democracy could supply two different parties with their distinct core of policies and supporters, it does not follow necessarily that bifactionalism must or will develop into a two-party system.

---

[26] One finding from the data collected by the author bears directly on this point. In spite of the high degree of non-performance and even double-dealing engaged in by many of the parish candidates who affiliate with a state ticket, in only one case was an affiliate termed a factional deserter. In the situation referred to, a legislative candidate from a south Louisiana parish supported Longite Spaht in the first primary in 1952, made the runoff primary, and then "flopped" (as my informant put it) to support Kennon against Spaht in the gubernatorial runoff. Both the legislative candidate and Kennon failed to carry the parish.

SOVEREIGNTY AND DEMOCRACY IN THE JAPANESE CONSTITUTION

KAZUO KAWAI
The Ohio State University

Some revision of the present Japanese constitution probably cannot long be put off. Often referred to as the "MacArthur Constitution," it is open to the charge that it needs to be brought into accord with Japan's restored status of independence.

Although the immediate pressure for change is directed at the existing constitutional ban on rearmament, a more important change that can be anticipated will concern the position of the emperor in relation to the locus of sovereignty. This bears directly on the basic nature of the Japanese state, the central problem of the most bitter controversy in Japanese constitutional history. This problem, now dormant, is likely to be revived very soon, for the present constitution's treatment of the status of the emperor is highly vulnerable on substantive, procedural, and historical grounds.

The substantive grounds for the vulnerability of the present constitution's provisions concerning the emperor are the simplest to explain. The constitution proclaims that "sovereign power resides with the people"[1] and that "the Emperor shall be the symbol of the State and of the unity of the people, deriving his position from the will of the people with whom resides sovereign power."[2] These are most explicit expressions of the doctrine of popular sovereignty, a doctrine completely alien to Japanese thought. Some Japanese thinkers had been intrigued by the Western doctrine of popular sovereignty, but until the appearance of the present constitution no one of any consequence had ever seriously considered that it would be applicable to Japan.

The essential nature of the Japanese state—designated as *kokutai*, or "national polity," in the jargon of Japanese political theory—has traditionally been considered to lie in the fact that Japan has been and shall be "reigned over and governed by a line of Emperors unbroken for ages eternal."[3] Japan has traditionally been a theocratic-patriarchal state in which the emperor occupied the position of godfather. While this position differed from that of a god in the Western sense, the emperor did occupy in the eyes of the Japanese a position of unique pre-eminence which was considered to be ordained in the natural order of things and which therefore enjoyed divine sanction. The Meiji Constitution of 1889 accurately reflected the Japanese view when it declared that "the Emperor is sacred and inviolable"[4] and that "the Emperor is the head of the Empire, combining in Himself the rights of sovereignty."[5]

To be sure, there has hardly ever been a time in all of Japan's history when the emperor has actually ruled; he has simply been the fountainhead of authority. The actual exercise of authority has always been entrusted to, or usurped by, advisers who relieved the emperor of the risk of committing political mistakes incompatible with his sacred character. This assumption of responsibility by his advisers gave rise to the doctrine that the emperor must not act except in accordance with their advice. Nevertheless, the theoretical supremacy of the emperor was never challenged until the MacArthur Constitution of 1947. Thus, while this constitution only recognized an historical fact in characterizing the emperor as "the symbol of the State," it introduced an unprecedented idea in attributing sovereignty to the people.

---

[1] Preamble, The Constitution of Japan.
[2] Chapter I, Article 1, The Constitution of Japan.
[3] Chapter I, Article 1, The Meiji Constitution.
[4] Chapter I, Article 3, The Meiji Constitution.
[5] Chapter I, Article 4, The Meiji Constitution.

The naturally-ordained supremacy of the emperor was not only a matter of political theory. It was buttressed by the entire social organization of Japan, whose systematic hierarchical structure logically calls for a capstone at the top. This social hierarchy is today undergoing rapid change, but it has not yet wholly disappeared. The functioning of this hierarchical machine requires a chain of authority extending from the apex to the bottom layer, and a chain of loyalty from the bottom layer to the apex. Even the complex lateral relationships within the layers of this pyramid are kept in order by their linkage to the clearly defined vertical relationship. In the case of such an integrated organization, in which each unit fits so neatly into its logically defined niche, the whole scheme appears to be ordained by the inherent nature of things. It is inconceivable that the capstone should owe its position to any free-will decision of the lower strata, for there can logically be no other choice.

Hence the doctrine of popular sovereignty with its implication of the social compact theory, as embodied in the present constitution, does violence to Japanese political theory and to Japanese social reality. A doctrine so out of keeping with the facts of Japanese life cannot hope to remain unchallenged.

There are procedural as well as substantive grounds for the vulnerability of the present constitution's provisions concerning the emperor. Had it been honestly acknowledged that a break with tradition was necessitated by new historical developments and justified by the changing character of modern Japanese society, the Japanese might have been prepared to accept the present constitution for what it was. But instead the Government resorted to a fiction which holds that there has been no essential change in the historic "national polity." Circumstances rather than design were undoubtedly responsible for this fiction, but it has placed the constitution in an untenably false position, from which it must sooner or later be rescued.

The first step in the procedure which led to this false position arose out of the circumstances of Japan's acceptance of the Potsdam Proclamation of July 26, 1945 as the basis for her surrender. One of the features of this Proclamation which appealed to the Japanese was the fact that it implied that the victorious Allies would not interfere with the institution of the emperorship.[6] Desiring more specific confirmation of this point, however, the leaders of the Japanese

[6] See Kazuo Kawai, "*Mokusatsu*, Japan's Response to the Potsdam Declaration," *Pacific Historical Review*, Vol. 19, pp. 409–14 (Nov., 1950).

Government, when drawing up their note of August 10, 1945 accepting the Potsdam Proclamation, intended to ask the Allied Powers for assurance that "the said Declaration does not comprise any demand which prejudices the *status of the Imperial Family.*" However, at the insistence of Baron Kiichiro Hiranuma, president of the Privy Council, the note was changed at the last minute to ask for assurance that "the said Declaration does not comprise any demand which prejudices *the prerogatives of His Majesty as a sovereign ruler.*"[7] A notable legal authority with strong conservative leanings, Baron Hiranuma apparently recognized the complications that might arise from the slightest ambiguity concerning the sovereignty of the emperor.

The Allied answer to this Japanese request for assurance respecting the sovereignty of the emperor was highly ambiguous:

> From the moment of surrender, the authority of the Emperor and the Japanese Government to rule the state shall be subject to the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, who will take such steps as he deems proper to effectuate the surrender terms.[8]

The ambiguity was obviously intentional. In order to induce the Japanese to surrender, the Allied Powers hoped to convey to them the impression that their request regarding the emperor had been granted. At the same time, in order to remain free to impose whatever changes in the imperial institution might later seem desirable, the Allied Powers carefully avoided making any definite commitment.[9]

This ambiguity posed a problem for the Japanese; the resulting controversy as to whether or not the Allied answer satisfactorily met their request for an assurance not only held up the surrender for approximately three days but even placed the surrender decision itself in serious jeopardy. The opponents of surrender argued that if the emperor were to be "subject to" the Allied Supreme Commander, his prerogatives would obviously be prejudiced. The advocates of surrender, however, argued that the prerogatives of the emperor would remain intact, since the exercise of his authority would be limited by the authority of the Allied Supreme Commander, only temporarily and then only insofar as necessary "to effectuate the surrender terms." The question was finally resolved by the emperor's arbitrary ruling that in his opinion the Allied terms did not prejudice his prerogatives as the sovereign ruler.[10]

This ruling overlooked the fact that the Potsdam Proclamation contained the statement that the Allied occupation forces would be withdrawn from Japan only after "there has been established, in accordance with the freely-expressed will of the Japanese people, a peacefully-inclined and responsible government."[11] If the nature of the Japanese government, including the status of the emperor, was to depend on "the freely-expressed will of the Japanese people," obviously there was implied a fundamental shift in the locus of sovereign power from the emperor to the people. In the face of this clause in the Potsdam Proclamation, the Allied Powers could hardly have assured the Japanese Government that the emperor's prerogatives as a sovereign ruler would not be prejudiced. Thus the Allied answer, while misleading in intention, was correctly noncommittal in fact. The Japanese official interpretation was therefore made, not on the basis of fact, but as a matter of expediency, to facilitate the necessary surrender. By thus accepting the Potsdam Proclamation as the basis of the surrender, Japan had actually acceded to a fundamental change in her "national polity." This inconsistency between the official explanation and the actuality has plagued the government ever since.

---

[7] Italics added. See Kazuo Kawai, "Militarist Activity between Japan's Two Surrender Decisions," *Pacific Historical Review*, Vol. 22, pp. 383–89 (Nov., 1953).

[8] SCAP, *The Political Reorientation of Japan* (Washington, 1950); Appendices, p. 415.

[9] See James F. Byrnes, *Speaking Frankly* (New York, 1947), pp. 206ff.

[10] See Kawai, "Militarist Activity between Japan's Two Surrender Decisions." This interpretation was assiduously maintained in the emperor's historic radio broadcast of August 15, 1945 announcing the surrender, in the passage: "Having been able to safeguard and maintain the structure of the Imperial State, We are always with ye, Our good and loyal subjects."

The second aspect of the procedural vulnerability of the present constitution is to be found in the legal form followed in the adoption of the constitution. It is an open secret that the constitution was drafted in General MacArthur's headquarters and forced upon the Japanese Government, although the Japanese were subsequently permitted to make a few minor modifications before final adoption.[12] While it follows generally the organization of the Meiji Constitution, it is in substance an entirely new document bearing little similarity to the earlier one, particularly with respect to the status of the emperor. Yet in accordance with Allied policy and in continuation of the fiction adopted by the Japanese Government at the time it accepted the Potsdam Proclamation, it was maintained that the MacArthur Constitution was nothing more than an amendment of the Meiji Constitution initiated by the Japanese themselves.[13] Accordingly, in the adoption of the MacArthur Constitution the regular procedure for the adoption of amendments as provided for in the Meiji Constitution was followed as closely as circumstances would permit.[14] While such a pretense of legal continuity was calculated to contribute to the authority of the present constitution by surrounding it with an aura of legitimacy, in some ways it actually weakened its authority by permeating it with the odor of chicanery and unreality.

This weakness of the MacArthur Constitution was readily apparent to the members of the Diet. Before finally voting on it, they subjected the Government to a searching questioning as to whether it did not in fact alter the

---

[11] Department of State, *Occupation of Japan: Policy and Progress* (Washington, 1946), Appendix 3, pp. 53–55.

[12] See Harry Emerson Wildes, *Typhoon in Tokyo* (New York, 1954), pp. 38–50, for the most revealing recent account of the drafting of the constitution.

[13] SCAP, *The Political Reorientation of Japan* (Washington, 1950), presents in two large volumes the official policy with respect to the handling of the problem of the constitution.

[14] Some of the members of the Far Eastern Commission, notably the British, apparently felt that even the method which was followed did not provide for sufficient legal continuity in relation to the old constitution. See United Press dispatch from Washington in *Pacific Stars and Stripes* (Tokyo), August 30, 1946.

"national polity." The Government compounded the vulnerability of the constitution by giving less than honest answers, which trapped it further in the mire of contradications.

At first the Government sought to soften the impact of the doctrine of popular sovereignty by making a euphemistic translation of the original English draft. The unlegalistic, literary quality of the Japanese language lent itself particularly well to such treatment. Thus, for example, the English original:

> We, the Japanese people, acting through our duly elected representatives . . . do proclaim the *sovereignty of the people's will* . . . [15]

emerged in an ambiguous Japanese form which, while not actually a mistranslation of the original, might also be translated back into English as:

> We, the Japanese people, acting through our duly elected representatives . . . do proclaim *in accordance with the supreme will of the people* . . . [16]

which, of course, has a different connotation.

The demand for blunt honesty made by members of the Diet finally forced the Government to produce a less ambiguous text, which was translated back into English as:

> We, the Japanese people, acting through our duly elected representatives . . . do proclaim that *sovereign power resides with the people* . . . [17]

and this was the form which appeared in the constitution as finally adopted.

But the Government next sought to interpret the word "sovereignty" in a special sense. Minister of State Tokujiro Kanamori tried to fend off embarrassing Diet interpellations by explaining:

> The word sovereignty is used with various different meanings by different people. However, if it is considered in the sense of from whence the will of the State is actually derived—in other words, the actual source of the will of the State—we believe it would be correct to say that in Japan it is without doubt the entire people *including the Emperor*. . . .
>
> If the word sovereignty is used to indicate the source of what may be regarded as the motive power of the actions of the State, then that source is the entire people *including the Emperor*. . . . The source of the will of the State is not the thinking of each individual. The will of the Japanese State is formed as the thinking of the tens of millions of our people combines and becomes organized. In other words, the substance of sovereignty lies in the *people as an organized entity, inclusive of the Emperor*. . . . The will of the State may be likened to that of a corporate body, to borrow a phrase often used by scholars, the idea being that the will of a corporate body is formed as it is linked with the will of each individual member.[18]

In other words, the people are sovereign, but "the people" means, not the people as opposed to the monarch, but the corporate body comprising all the individuals in the state, including the emperor. In such an organized corporate body, the emperor naturally stands at the apex. Thus the Government argued that popular sovereignty did not alter the traditional "national polity."

---

[15] Draft Constitution of Japan, in *Nippon Times* (Tokyo), March 8, 1946. Italics added.

[16] " . . . *kokoni kokumin shiko ishi ni sengen shi* . . . "

[17] Preamble, The Constitution of Japan. Italics added.

[18] Quoted in Kisaburo Yokota, "Sovereignty under the New Constitution," *Contemporary Japan*, Vol. 16, pp. 136–37 (April–June, 1947). Italics added.

When many members of the Diet protested against this sophistry, the Government shifted its ground and resorted to still another sophistry which was inconsistent with the first. It admitted that there had indeed been a legal change, but insisted that it was a "mere" legal change. Historically, the emperor of Japan has been more a moral than a political ruler. Hence, the Government could assert with some show of plausibility that sovereignty in Japan is a moral, not a legal or political, concept and that the moral position of the dynasty, which is the essence of the "national polity," therefore remains intact.[19]

These arguments of course had little effect on the eventual adoption of the constitution, for the course of events was really dictated by the overriding argument of MacArthur's occupation army. But the obscurantism of the Government's tortured explanations served to confuse still further the authority of the constitution.

It is not correct to assume, as some critics have done,[20] that this equivocal character of the Government's explanations stemmed from a reactionary conspiracy to water down the democratic objectives of the Occupation-dictated constitution and to salvage as much of the authoritarian position of the emperor as possible. Quite to the contrary, some of the severest attacks upon the constitution as it came from MacArthur's headquarters were leveled by staunch liberals who had distinguished themselves in the difficult early struggles for the democratization of the Japanese government. The Government was sincerely anxious to get the necessary task of adopting the new constitution over with as expeditiously as possible, and to this end it was willing to use any argument that would serve to mollify the opponents of the constitution. To be sure, the Government clutched at fallacious arguments which confused its stand, but it did so in an attempt to defend the constitution, not to subvert it. This paradoxical situation will become clear when we examine the historical grounds for the vulnerability of the constitution.

Although in the past all Japanese, as we have seen, had accepted the sovereign authority of the emperor, the exercise of his authority had always been delegated to advisers who assumed responsibility for all official acts. The Meiji Restoration of 1868, which abolished the dual government of the Tokugawa Shogunate and restored unified government directly under the Throne, did not fundamentally alter this traditional delegation of the emperor's authority: it merely effected a change in the clique of advisers. Yet the Restoration was somewhat more than just a palace revolution. For although there was no mass movement, the new set of advisers owed their rise to power at least in part to the upsurge of new economic and social forces which coincided with the influx of Western influence. These factors had to be given recognition in the new government. At the same time, the new set of imperial advisers, while motivated less by selfseeking than by belief in their own indispensability to the nation, were nevertheless anxious to assure for themselves as much power as possible.

---

[19] See Harold S. Quigley, "Japan's Constitutions: 1890 and 1947," this REVIEW, Vol. 41, pp. 867–69 (Oct., 1947).

[20] For example, W. Macmahon Ball, *Japan, Enemy or Ally?* (New York, 1949), Chs. 3 and 6, voices the suspicion that there was a deliberate plot on the part of the Japanese leaders to thwart the Occupation.

The Meiji Constitution of 1889 was designed to meet these requirements. It sought to mollify the new social forces by conceding to them some of the trappings of representative government; it sought to satisfy Western standards of acceptability by setting up governmental institutions resembling in form those of the West. But it also sought to preserve and even to strengthen the oligarchic rule of the new group of imperial advisers. This it did by formalizing the exalted powers[21] of the emperor in such a way that they had to be exercised by these advisers,[22] who, being responsible only to the emperor whom they advised,[23] were in effect responsible only to themselves.

The Meiji Constitution, in other words, was rigged to safeguard the power of of the clique that had engineered the Restoration. But the very fact that a written constitution had been adopted at all provided an entering wedge for the democratization of the Japanese government. No one, of course, could directly challenge the fact that the emperor in his sovereign capacity had conferred the constitution upon his people. But it could be argued that the emperor had been constrained to grant the constitution in response to the pressure of the new social forces, which could no longer be ignored. It could also be argued that, extensive as the emperor's powers were, the fact that these powers were defined at all in the constitution signified that they were subject to limitations. Finally it could be argued that the emperor, by having granted a constitution that stipulated that his powers were to be exercised through duly constituted executive, legislative, judicial, and advisory bodies, was now himself bound by the provisions of the constitution.

The theoretical justification for this limitation on the exercise of the emperor's powers, and thus on the arbitrary actions of his advisers, was provided by the corporate theory of the state, which defines the state as a corporate entity possessed of a legal personality. Although this theory was derived from the German concept of the *Rechtsstaat,* which had been picked up by Japanese constitutional lawyers studying in Europe, it could easily be assimilated into the stream of Japanese thought, for it was quite compatible with the concept of the nation as an integrated organism inherent in the Japanese view of their theocratic-patriarchal state. It was thus much more acceptable to them than the doctrine of popular sovereignty, with its corollary—so completely alien to Japanese thought—of the social compact. At the same time the concept of the *Rechsstaat,* while regarded as ultraconservative in the West, had liberalizing implications for Japan, for in a corporate state the emperor is not himself the state but is merely one of its components. The emperor is sovereign, to be sure, but only in the sense of being the bearer of sovereignty as an organ of the state. As such, the emperor, even though he is the supreme organ, cannot act arbitrarily, but can exercise his powers only in consonance with other organs of the state. This concept could lead logically to making the emperor's advisers responsible not solely to the emperor, and thereby responsible in effect only to themselves, but responsible also to such other organs of the state as the legislature.

---

[21] Chapter I, The Meiji Constitution.

[22] Chapter IV, Article 55, The Meiji Constitution.

[23] Preamble, The Meiji Constitution.

The beauty of this "organ theory" (as the Japanese term it), of the emperor lay in the fact that it provided a *rationale* for the democratization of the Japanese government which, while not wholly indigenous, was nevertheless comprehensible to the Japanese in terms of their own ideological pattern. At the same time, it weakened the notion of the mystic uniqueness of the Japanese "national polity" by explaining the nature of the emperorship in rational, universalistic terms. It provided an unbroken bridge between tradition and modern democratic government over which the Japanese could advance under their own motive power.

The traditionalists naturally abhorred the "organ theory" as a heresy. A controversy between the two schools of thought was precipitated within the Law Faculty of the Tokyo Imperial University in 1912, when Professor Shinkichi Uesugi, the chief disciple of the great traditional theorist Professor Yatsuka Hozumi, openly attacked Professor Tatsukichi Minobé, the principal exponent of the "organ theory." While the arguments brought forth cannot be reviewed here, it should be noted that Uesugi sought to discredit the "organ theory" on the grounds that it was incipient republicanism in disguise, that it was the product of the European movement from absolute monarchism to popular sovereignty, and hence that it was subversive of Japan's "national polity." Minobé held that the corporate theory had nothing to do with monarchism or republicanism as such but merely elucidated the true nature of all states, and that, far from being inimical to monarchical sovereignty, the "organ theory" in no way conflicted with the "national polity."

In a bitter debate that raged for two decades and eventually involved the entire Japanese political and academic worlds, Minobé apparently emerged victorious. While Uesugi's supporters steadily dwindled, Minobé was loaded with official honors, his works became the authorized handbooks for public school teachers, his disciples filled most of the important government offices, and the general public swung behind him. All this was accompanied by a steady growth in parliamentary government that, while feeble by Western standards, held promise for the further democratization of Japan.[24]

The significance of Minobé's success, however, did not lie wholly in the general acceptance of his "organ theory" as such. The rationality of this theory appealed to the new generation, educated in the rational, scientific atmosphere of modern Japan's Westernized school system. However, many who rallied to Minobé's support harbored doubts as to the validity of the "organ theory" itself. Yet they supported him because of the character which the controversy had assumed; Minobé had become the symbol of progress, enlightenment, and democracy as opposed to the dead hand of tradition.[25] As new times created new social classes which strained at the immobility of the traditional hierarchical social structure, Minobé appeared to these classes as the standard-bearer of their assault on the ideological underpinnings of the old order. The "organ theory" became the battlecry of democracy.[26]

---

[24] Most of the foregoing material on Minobé and the "organ theory" is derived from the work of my colleague, Frank O. Miller, "The Constitutional Theory of Minobé Tatsukichi" (diss. in preparation, Univ. of California, Berkeley).

If Minobé prevailed in the comparatively liberal atmosphere of the 1920's because he had become a symbol of liberalism, it was precisely because he was such a symbol that disaster later struck him. As Japanese liberalism succumbed to a trend toward military dictatorship in the 1930's, the forces of reaction concentrated their fury on the popular liberal symbol. Unable to best Minobé in argument, in 1935 they coerced the Government, which by then was subservient to militarist intimidation, into arbitrarily proscribing the "organ theory." Such an act could not permanently resolve the controversy over the "national polity," however, for it was a decision imposed virtually by military fiat. Military fiats may produce outward compliance, but they do not change men's minds. Whenever the reactionary movement should wane, it was to be expected that at the first opportunity the "organ theory" would be raised again as the symbol of a reviving liberalism.

In the light of this historical background, the seriousness of the substantive and procedural defects of the present constitutional provisions concerning the emperor becomes clear. When, with the establishment of the Occupation, the way seemed open again for the resumption of democratic growth, the sudden appearance of the MacArthur Constitution struck the Japanese liberals with consternation. While this constitution was intended to establish democracy in Japan, it ran counter in almost every way to the means by which the Japanese liberals had been trying to make democracy palatable to their countrymen. It proclaimed the alien doctrine of popular sovereignty, with which the reactionaries had tried to smear the liberals and which the liberals had striven so hard to deny. It cast doubt on the "national polity," whereas the liberals had tried very hard to show that increasing democratization was in keeping with the "national polity." It imposed these ideas virtually by military fiat, just as the reactionaries had imposed their ideas in 1935. This did not look like the way to vindicate the historic struggle for democracy in Japan.

The American authors of the MacArthur Constitution could not have been expected to appreciate these historical implications. It would be unfair, also, to ignore the argument that the situation in Japan called for drastic revolutionary measures; that the Japanese liberals, if left to their own devices, would have acted too slowly; and that General MacArthur had no practical choice but to act arbitrarily in order to head off dangerous developments. It is also true that some Japanese liberals felt that, considering the circumstances, it would be wise to accept the MacArthur Constitution, to acknowledge frankly that the "national polity" had been altered, and to sell the Japanese public on the idea that such a clean break with the past had become desirable.

---

[25] See the testimony of Toshiyoshi Miyazawa in "Nihon Hogaku no Kaiko to Tembo," *Horitsu Jiho*, Vol. 20, no. 12 (Dec., 1948).

[26] It might be objected that the "organ theory" was not necessarily democratic and that Minobé himself was hardly a democrat by temperament. But circumstances caused the "organ theory" and Minobé to play the role of spearheads of the trend toward democracy.

But it is understandable that most of the Japanese liberals were reluctant to write off their own struggles of half a century and to accept instead a ready-made foreign gift. Except for their setback in the 1930's, they had had heartening success in the past in steadily adapting democracy to the Japanese environment. What they had cultivated so arduously and so long seemed to them to hold greater promise of further growth in the native soil than a sudden new transplantation. What they had fought for so hard had more value to them than something handed to them by an alien, if benevolent, conqueror. Minobé himself thought that the Meiji Constitution, properly interpreted, would be sufficient to assure the full growth of democracy.[27] Others favored some revision of the Meiji Constitution, but only such revision as would facilitate the evolutionary democratization of Meiji institutions. Few had faith in innovations that ignored the Japanese historical background.

The issues could not be openly and honestly debated at the time of the adoption of the MacArthur Constitution because of the restraints inherent under Occupation conditions. The Government, as has already been noted, further muddled the issue by trying to pass the new constitution off as being more in accord with what most Japanese wanted than in fact it was. But now at last, with the Occupation fading into the past, the inhibitions surrounding discussions of the constitution are beginning to fall away. Hence the likelihood of revision is steadily growing. Some restoration of the theoretical authority of the emperor, but with such popular controls as are called for by the "organ theory," appears to be in prospect.[28]

It is to be expected that the reactionaries will take advantage of the growing pressure for constitutional revision to try to slip in changes unfavorable to democracy. But this should not be allowed to obscure the fact that many sincere advocates of democracy also believe that some modification of the present constitution is in order. With the constitution, as with so many other matters, the Occupation tried to go too far and too fast in conferring democracy from above. As a result, much of the handiwork of the Occupation was left dangling in mid-air, with no contact with the foundations that had been laid earlier by the painful efforts of the native pioneers of democracy. A change in the present constitutional status of the emperor, therefore, need not necessarily mean a retrograde step toward absolutism. On the contrary, it might well serve to strengthen Japanese democratic development by re-establishing it upon a sounder historical foundation.

---

[27] *Nippon Times* (Tokyo), Oct. 16, 1945.

[28] See, for example, the proposal of Progressive (now Democratic) party leaders that the emperor be changed from "symbol of the State" to "chief of State," in *Nippon Times*, July 17, 1954.

THE FRENCH COUNCIL OF STATE: ITS ROLE IN THE FORMULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

GEORGES LANGROD
University of the Saar,
French National Center for Scientific Research (Paris)

In order to understand the nature, evolution, and basic conceptions of French administrative law, it is essential to study the role of the *Conseil d'État*, the supreme administrative tribunal. Creative and dynamic, often even bold, the jurisprudence of this remarkable body remains nevertheless prudent and fundamentally evolutionary. One would search in vain for the major principle of French administrative law in the legislative texts; they have been developed by the jurisprudence of this Council as it proceeds, by a series of successive decisions, from specific cases to ultimate yet flexible generalizations, establishing basic legal concepts not only by the skillful interpretation of texts, but also by creative construction when the texts are silent. Together with its doctrinal achievements, the Council's *usus fori* or judicial practice forms a flexible source of principles applicable to specific cases. The legislator may regulate according to circumstances and the necessities of the moment, without concerning himself with general principles or even conforming rigorously to those created by jurisprudence and theory. But the administrative judge, in administering justice, performs a genuinely creative task and establishes bases for legal thought.

The imposing edifice of French administrative law established in the course of the last century has been from the start closely associated with the proceedings of the Council of State, with the extraordinary prestige it enjoys and the universal respect accorded its opinions. In judging concrete cases, the Council of State sees to it, of course, that existing laws and regulations are obeyed, but it also gives direction to the development of administrative law by its creative and interpretative function. French administrative law is not case law, and even less common law: the role of statute law is much more important than in England or the United States, and is by no means limited to the formulation of *addenda* and *errata* for a pre-established system presumed to have existed previously. Consequently, the Council's interpretative function is quite broad. If one reads only the laws, he may seize upon mere scattered fragments and miss the creative and legislating aspect of the judicial process, which unifies isolated legislative rules and places them in a conceptual framework governed by established principles.

Although such a creative process, the product of the daily thought and action of judges, may be found in other countries and in other branches of public or private law, it constitutes such a distinctive feature of French administrative law that its importance can be neglected only at the risk of misunderstanding the true situation in France. When the student of comparative law sets out to understand the general role and position of the Council in the governmental machinery of 19th and 20th century France, he should not limit his inquiry to its function of ruling upon legality. He must add to this a crucial fact which cannot be discovered in the legislative statute governing the attributes and structure of the Council of State—namely, that the Council has, for 150 years, taken upon itself a constructive mission resulting from its view of administrative problems, based upon its time-honored tradition, and conditioned by its innate practical sense. This is why the predominant aspect of French administrative law, unlike other types of French law, is that it is "judge-made," in spite of the fact that legislative statutes concerning administrative activity abound, and indeed are multiplying at a truly alarming rate. Goodnow, in describing the functions of the Council of State for the American reader, speaks only of its control over formal legality, without analyzing closely the creative mission of the Council and its place in the system of French administrative law.[1] This function, however, cannot be stressed enough. French administrative law is the vital source of inspiration for other national systems in Europe and elsewhere precisely because of its judicial origin.[2] Thanks to the flexibility, talent, and courage of generations of leading administrative judges, it is governed by well-defined principles and manages to combine utility with internal logic even while being constantly threatened with the possible overturn of the Council's jurisprudence. The Council of State has maintained a remarkable continuity despite major economic, political, and social upheavals and in the face of institutional changes and fluctuations in political theories. It forms a fixed center of ideas and functions which remains while other institutions disappear or are completely transformed. Nor does its influence within the present governmental structure seem likely to diminish. The Council's structure and recruitment were changed by the administrative reorganization of 1945 and by the creation in the same year of the National School of Administration, but its basic role was not at all affected by these developments. For the role of the Council has never rested on specific statutes, but has always resulted, within the framework of existing laws, from the force of circumstance. Only by delving into these circumstantial factors can one hope to grasp the meaning and importance of this unique development, which has gone on quite undisturbed by the various administrative innovations attendant upon nationalization, the development of social legislation, and the constitutional creation of the French Union. Indeed, these developments on the French scene have themselves been profoundly influenced by the activity of the Council—as a consultative organization utilized by Parliament and the Administration, if not directly as judicial controller. Furthermore, all recent large-scale administrative codifications represent either a wholesale adoption of the Council's opinions on the subject (e.g., the civil service law of October 19, 1946) or work influenced by the Council's judgments and advice (e.g., the general tax code of April 6, 1950). Finally, we shall see that the total reorganization of the French administrative litigation system (*systéme du contentieux*) in 1954, the culmination of decades of debate, gave full recognition to the prestige and leading role of the Council of State. In its own activity, as well as in that which affects it from the outside as a result of legislative reforms, the Council represents a judicious blend of tradition and progress.

---

[1] Frank J. Goodnow, *Comparative Administrative Law* (New York, 1893), Vol. 2, pp. 217ff.

[2] In order to gain an appreciation of the influence of French administrative law, and hence of the *Conseil d'État*, the reader should consult the series of studies contained in a volume published on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the Council's uninterrupted existence: *Livre jubilaire du Conseil d'État* (Paris, 1949). Councils of State modeled on the French have been adopted in many lands, including Belgium, Greece, and Egypt.

Attributes of the Council of State. It is important to note[3] that the Council of State by no means monopolizes litigation involving the Administration. For the relationships of the Administration are governed partly by administrative law and partly by private law; hence lawsuits which arise with respect to them belong partly to the administrative judge (the Council of State and connected bodies), and partly to the civil or penal judge (the *Cour de Cassation* and the ordinary courts of law). The well-known French *régime administratif*,[4] in light of the facts, has never been "totalitarian," in spite of certain past tendencies. For on the one hand we find numerous examples of private management of public affairs, with the civil contract playing the major role. On the other hand, the state retains the option of applying administrative or private law to various administrative activities. There is a growing number of administrative operations to which civil law now applies and which are accordingly under the jurisdiction of civil courts.[5] Since nothing in the intrinsic nature of these operations calls for a separate legal system, administrative law does not apply to them, and hence is not the only legal framework for dealing with administrative activities. While administrative law may still have a position that is qualitatively distinct and quantitatively dominant in this branch of state activity, it is vital to keep in mind the hybrid and dualistic nature of this legal regime which is by no means exclusively that of administrative law.

The Council's jurisdictional competence hardly describes its total activities as they are revealed by its rich history or by existing law. For the Council of State has a three-fold character: it maintains judicial control of the Administration, it participates directly and indirectly in the actual administrative process, and it serves as consultant to the government by providing juridical advice to the legislating body. The last two functions constitute very important and original features of the Council's activity.

The French civil code of 1803, the *Code Napoléon*, represents in its entirety the work of the Council of State. The views expressed by the Council in its opinions and in its work of codification have played a major historical part in the whole evolution. The Council continues to deliver opinions on the form and substance of laws and administrative regulations (*règlements*); the legality of some of these acts has been conditioned by the Council's previous advice. It is also consulted by the Administration as to the legality of particular provisions, as to the manner in which certain matters should be codified, and in general upon various difficulties which arise in administrative matters.

---

[3] As does Carl J. Friedrich, *Constitutional Government and Democracy* (Boston, 1949), pp. 114–15.

[4] The regime that so disturbed Dicey because he considered it "monstrous" and leading to "bureaucratic despotism."

[5] Although the jurisdiction of the judge (ordinary or administrative) does not correspond exactly to the nature of the law (private or administrative) applicable to the Administration, this correspondence is roughly correct.

Two large groups of the Council's opinions must be distinguished. On the one hand, there is an area in which the Government, without being obliged by law to do so, may ask for the Council's advice before it undertakes a legislative or administrative act, whether of general or specific nature. Thus the Government may—and indeed often does—consult the Council, which consequently becomes an important center for the drafting of basic texts and opinions communicated to the Government at the latter's request.

On the other hand, there are three categories in which prior consultation of the Council of State is mandatory by law: (1) on all Government bills submitted to Parliament, whatever their subject may be; (2) on all governmental decrees having the force of law (decree-laws) dealing only with certain subjects and passed for a certain period of time; and (3) on all non-legislative decrees of the Government, called *règlements d'Administration publique*. This term simply signifies that unlike other categories of rules these latter regulations must necessarily be submitted to the Council of State for a preliminary opinion or be disallowed.[6] It is well known that the Government, in practice, continually takes cognizance of the Council's opinions to a remarkable degree. These opinions, furthermore, may later be reviewed by the Council in its role as administrative court, for they do not bind the Council in its judicial function.[7] Since the Administration always defers to the decisions of the Council of State as administrative tribunal, the Government, although it is not legally obligated to do so, respects the Council's advice even when it extends beyond a ruling on legality and has to do with administrative expediency.

Moreover, since 1945 the Council of State has enjoyed a certain degree of initiative in the giving of advice; it may of its own volition direct the Government's attention to needed legislative and administrative reforms. Finally, there is a constant interpenetration of active administrators into the ranks of the Council and of Council members into the active bureaucracy, which makes for a permanent and intimate contact between the Council and the Administration. We shall see later how unusual this particular system is.

Situated at the heart of the Administration, the Council of State does not inspire the mistrust that would naturally be felt toward external controls; and yet part of the Council exercises a control that has become increasingly judicial because of its rigorous objectivity. The other part of the Council cooperates in many ways with the Government and the administrative bodies, accumulating various functions that demand complex structural and procedural arrangements and call for a very high intellectual and professional level on the part of its members. The whole history of the Council of State shows that it has succeeded in attaining unity within this complexity and in developing an admirable *esprit de corps* in spite of the variety of its methods of recruitment; and that it has preserved its great prestige and fulfilled its numerous duties conscientiously and with competence.

---

[6] Hence only private bills put forward by members of Parliament are excluded from preliminary scrutiny by the Council of State. Rules other than those *d'administration publique* may always be submitted to the Council for advice if the Government so wishes.

[7] The Council of State thus has, in principle, control over all administrative activity, including that based upon its own prior advice.

Judicial Organization. We must always bear in mind the dualistic nature of the French judicial hierarchy, with its separation of legal actions resulting from a specific interpretation of the principle of separation of powers: alongside of ordinary civil or criminal proceedings, we find administrative proceedings. This is by no means a peculiarity of the French system: wherever provision is made for administrative justice apart from ordinary courts—no matter what its structure and degree of independence with respect to ordinary justice and the administration—some such differentiation is necessary. In France these hierarchies are completely independent of each other. The ordinary courts form the "judicial" power authorized by the Constitution, while administrative justice belongs, in terms of the separation of powers, to the "executive" power, even though it is basically separate from the active Administration and indeed is predicated upon the independence of its judicial members. One must not be misled by Anglo-Saxon usage into classifying administrative justice as one of the "quasi-judicial" functions of government: it is a genuine judicial process, by virtue of its nature, the respect accorded its decisions, and the prestige of its personnel—even though the formal façade remains administrative and the 1946 Constitution makes no mention of it whatsoever.

This dual apparatus for the maintenance of justice requires an arbitrator to resolve conflicts of jurisdiction between the two parallel hierarchies, each administering the law in its own domain. This function is entrusted to the *Tribunal des Conflits*, a superior body of mixed composition. Similar courts generally exist in European countries wherever such a dual system of justice is maintained.

Thus the Council of State engages in control of the Administration in judging administrative litigation, and the *Tribunal des Conflits* decides conflicts of jurisdiction between ordinary and administrative courts. These two institutions together have evolved, during the latter decades of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th, the great edifice of French administrative law. The principle, still accepted in some other countries, of the non-responsibility of public authority insofar as it is an attribute of national sovereignty, has been progressively abolished in France and replaced by the novel principle of administrative responsibility at all levels of government—national, departmental, and communal—toward individuals injured by administrative action or neglect.[8] In this way specific legal channels have been established to assure the consumer of public services of a network of efficient legal protection against arbitrary acts, channels which lead to the total annulment of an illegal administrative act.[9] To mention only two basic achievements among many, we may cite the following contributions to jurisprudence: within the area of administrative responsibility, the theory of "lack of foresight" (*théorie de l'imprévision*), which has been established by the Council of State to govern the unusual contractual obligations involved in a public service concession with respect to the concessioner and the consumers; and within the area of abuse of power of which the Administration may be guilty, the theory of the "embezzlement of power" (*détournement de pouvoir*), by which the Council enlarged the grounds for possible annulment of suspicious administrative acts by taking into account the motivations of public officials—in particular, their subordination of means to the end being pursued. One cannot find a legislative basis for these two theories: they have been created by the administrative judge or the *Tribunal des Conflits* (or, frequently, the two in succession); theory has adopted and schematized them, while the legislator either preserves silence on the subject or refers indirectly to the work of jurisprudence. These doctrines have been accepted in other countries,[10] and have enriched the universal legal heritage.

Composition of the Council. The present composition of the Council of State, established by the 1945 legislation,[11] is as follows: The Council is accountable to and officially presided over by the Premier. In his absence this duty falls to the Minister of Justice, but in point of fact it is usually the vice-president of the Council who actually presides. The Council itself is made up of five section presidents, 47 regular councilors (*Conseillers d'État en service ordinaire*), 12 advisory councilors (*Conseillers d'État en service extraordinaire*), 50 masters (*maîtres des requêtes*), and 48 auditors.[12] Two out of three regular councilors are chosen from among the masters, the third nomination being left to the Government.[13] Three out of four masters are chosen from among the first-class auditors, with the last nomination again left to the Government's choice.[14] All first-class auditors, without exception, are chosen from among second-class auditors. Every member of the Council of State is appointed and recalled by decree, on the proposal of the Minister of Justice.[15]

---

[8] These legal actions are said to be *de pleine juridiction*.

[9] Known as *ouvertures* for *recours pour excès de pouvoir*.

[10] The *arrêts* of the Council of State and of the *Tribunal des Conflits* may easily be found in the *Recueil des arrêts du Conseil d'État*, the *Recueil général des lois et des arrêts*, edited by Sirey, and in the collections published by Dalloz. Summaries and critical articles on the Council's decrees are published in the *Revue du Droit public* and in the *Études et documents* which the Council of State has published since 1947. Hauriou's valuable notes (concerning the period from 1892 to 1929) have been published separately in three volumes, *La jurisprudence administrative* (Paris, 1929); those of Waline have been appearing in the *Revue du Droit public* since 1945. The standard treatises on French administrative law (those of Hauriou, Duguit, and Bonnard among the older works; those of Waline, Laubadère, and Duez-Debeyre among the recent) are based, of course, on the achievements of this administrative jurisprudence.

[11] Ordinance of July 31, 1945.

[12] Of whom 20 are first class auditors and 28 second-class.

[13] Since 1954, one *conseiller d'État en service ordinaire* and two *maîtres des requêtes* are chosen from among the presidents or councilors of the *tribunaux administratifs* (see below).

Advisory councilors are chosen from among qualified persons in different fields of national activity, other than parliamentary.[16] They are named for annual terms, which may be renewed. These councilors are not permitted to take part in the court proceedings; they participate only in the Council's consultative and extra-judicial work, although they sit in the General Assembly and on the Permanent Commission.[17]

Under the laws and regulations governing the National School of Administration,[18] one must have successfully completed its course of studies before being named a second-class auditor.[19] This means that those newcomers to the Council who represent the base of its "career service" are trained together with other candidates for public life, the future civil "administrators."[20] This schooling replaces the specialized instruction and examinations that existed before this administrative reform. Furthermore, those who are admitted to the Council represent by law the élite of each graduating class in the School of Administration; they have emerged, on the basis of course work, examinations, and probationary periods, as the most highly qualified candidates.

Entry into the Council of State is thus accomplished by one of two means: (1) by the career method of starting at the bottom, after graduating from the *École nationale d'Administration* in the prescribed fashion, and then moving up through the ranks, or (2) similarly, by obtaining some higher post from the outside, within the quota set aside by law for recruitment by such means.[21] Just as the independence enjoyed by all members of the Council, regardless of rank, is not fixed by any formal guarantee, but has nevertheless taken on the authority of custom, so these recruitments from outside are always consistent with the high caliber expected of members in this "High Assembly." Hence balance is maintained in spite of the different methods of recruitment.

---

[14] In order to be named *maître des requêtes* "from the outside," one must be at least 30 years old and have 10 years of public service (civil or military). Minimum age for regular councilors of State is 40 years.

[15] The decree nominating regular councilors of State is taken to the Council of Ministers on the proposal of the President of that Council and the Minister of Justice. The masters are named upon presentation of the so-called "bureau of the Council of State," composed of the vice-president in deliberation with all the section presidents; the same manner of presentation applies to the nomination of first-class auditors. All members of the Council are recalled in the same way they are named.

[16] Formerly all *conseillers d'État en service extraordinaire* were recruited from among high-level administrators. This recruitment has been considerably extended since 1945.

[17] Unlike all other members of the Council, the *conseillers d'État en service extraordinaire* do not receive a steady salary, but are reimbursed for services rendered.

[18] Ordinance of Oct. 9, 1945; internal regulation of Jan. 16, 1947, etc.

[19] *I.e.*, one must (1) have passed the entrance examination (either the one given to civil servants or the one given to graduates of university level with no previous administrative experience); (2) have obtained a satisfactory average grade at the end of the second year of studies; (3) be classed, consequently, at the head of the "*premier groupe*," in which candidates are apportioned according to merit; they may then freely choose from several administrative careers, the top rank of these being the Council of State.

[20] Analogous to the British "administrative class."

[21] The vice-president, the section presidents, and the councilors retire at the age of 70; all other member of the Council of State retire at 65.

All members of the Council pass from one section to another throughout their careers—in particular, from the litigation section to the purely administrative sections. In the course of their careers they may perform their normal functions or they may be delegated (for two years at most) to another public activity (e.g., that of director of a ministry, or director or member of a minister's *cabinet*, or legislative counselor for a protectorate), or, finally, they may be given leave of absence (*hors cadres*) for a period of not more than five years.[22] In the last case, members on leave of absence may be appointed to posts in the government service or in international organizations; they may serve as teachers or fulfill a governmental mission abroad; or they may sometimes occupy a post conferred by the government in private establishments under the control of the state. This current and general practice of detaching members of the Council for varying periods of service in important government posts[23] secures the participation of specialists highly qualified in the affairs of government and public enterprises of all sorts. Moreover, members of the Council, no matter what their rank, and without being formally detached from the Council, may participate in the work of commissions, committees, and other organizations within the ministries and the public service in general, provided they first obtain the permission of the vice president of the Council. Thus many members of the Council preside over various proceedings or perform in judicial functions, incidentally conferring on these extracurricular activities part of the prestige of the Council of State.

Internal Structure. The internal structure of the Council of State is as follows:

1. The General Assembly of the Council, composed of all its members meeting *in corpore*,[24] deals with all questions submitted to the Council. These may

---

[22] When a leave of absence follows upon some assignment, its duration is reduced by the length of the latter. A leave of absence may be extended for another five years, by permission of the vice-president of the Council in deliberation with the section presidents. However, auditors may not be assigned or given leaves of absence until they have served four years with the Council.

[23] Among the posts occupied in 1949 by members of the Council of State on leave of absence were, for example, the following: the director general of taxes, of population, and of cultural relations with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; the director general of social security; the secretary general of government, of the National Economic Council, of the military government of the Rhineland, of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and of the protectorate of Morocco; the director of the Civil Service with the presidency of the government, of the central office of the Ministry for Reconstruction, of the post-entry training at the National School of Administration, and of the public food supply; the prefect of police at Paris; the high commissioner of the Republic of Cameroons; the head of the French financial mission to the United States; the judicial councilor of the Tunisian government; and the government commissioner for the Bank of Paris and the Low Countries (see the *Annuaire du Conseil d'État*, 1949).

[24] Twenty regular councilors constitute a quorum.

be of a legislative nature, or may concern drafts of administrative regulations or certain special matters.[25] Or they may be questions that have been sent to the Assembly because of their importance by a minister, by the vice-president of the Council, or by the president of a section (or the section itself). Urgent legislative matters are, however, sent to the Permanent Commission. Thus each internal division of the Council may transmit to the General Assembly any case that, in its judgment, requires the Assembly's deliberation because it involves some new principle or some exceptional circumstance.

2. The Permanent Commission, drawn from all the sections, is composed of a section president, five regular councilors (four of whom must belong to the administrative sections), and four advisory councilors. It is charged with examining those urgent government bills or proposed *décrets* having the force of law that are submitted to the Council for its opinion by the minister concerned.[26] Although the Permanent Commission was intended by statute to operate only in exceptional cases, it has, since 1945, found itself replacing to a great extent other branches of the Council in the field of legislative consultation.[27]

3. The four administrative sections[28] have jurisdiction over legislative and administrative matters, and deal with all else that does not fall into the category of administrative litigation. They function in individual sections, in groups of two sections, or "in commission" (when more than two sections are involved). Regular councilors are assigned to one of the four sections by the Premier, upon recommendation of the Minister of Justice and after the vice-president of the Council of State has deliberated on the appointment with the section presidents. Advisory councilors are assigned to administrative sections by the vice-president, who also assigns masters and auditors, after consulting the section presidents.[29]

4. The litigation section is made up of a section president and 18 regular councilors. This section decides all cases coming under the jurisdiction of the Council, and is divided into eight subsections, each of which has three councilors as members. The section exercises its functions according to the subject

---

[25] The creation of religious establishments, certain treaties passed by the city of Paris, changes in the territorial boundaries of communes, decrees on the subject of maritime seizures, and demands for mining rights.

[26] In practice, by the Secretary-General of the government acting on delegation.

[27] The number of cases examined by the Permanent Commission was as follows: 500 in 1945, 220 in 1946, 246 in 1947, 215 in 1948–49, 104 in 1949–50, and 120 in 1950–51.

[28] They are as follows: the section of the interior (with jurisdiction over matters depending on the presidency of the government, the ministries of justice, interior, national education, etc.); the section on finances (ministries of finance, foreign affairs, national defense, overseas, etc.); the section on public works (ministries of national economy, public works and transport, agriculture, postal services, reconstruction and urbanism, etc.); and the social section (ministries of labor, public health and population, veterans, etc.).

[29] An absent councilor of State may be replaced by the senior *maître des requêtes* in the section. The secretary general of the Council is chosen from among the *maîtres des requêtes* assigned to the administrative sections. The *maîtres des requêtes* and auditors belonging to the administrative sections and to the litigations section may be called to participate in the work of the Permanent Commission.

under consideration—either in a subsection or in two grouped subsections, or in plenary sessions of the whole litigation section. Any case may be referred to this plenary session, in which a certain number of members of the administrative sections must take part.[30] Although government ministers may, if they wish, participate in deliberations of the Council which concern their departments, they lose this right with respect to the adjudication of administrative disputes (since they may be involved in them as a party). "Government commissioners" and their assistants take part in the section's proceedings; they are chosen from among the masters and auditors in the disputes section, and are named by the Minister of Justice on recommendation of the vice-president of the Council of State and the president of the litigation section. The role of the government commissioner in each case is particularly important, for he delivers in open session an opinion, later published,[31] regarding the entire legal situation. The successive conclusions of these commissioners contribute a great deal to the explanation of judicial decisions, to the stabilization of the principles enunciated, and to the elaboration of doctrine.

From this explanation of the Council of State's structure, it should be clear that the Council is not a body whose integral parts are sharply separated from each other, nor yet a hermetically sealed group closed off from the outside. The auditors, as we have seen, circulate between sections. There are collective groups within the Council, such as the General Assembly, made up of all the members, and the Permanent Commission, or the plenary session of the litigation section, made up of delegates from all sections. On the other hand, the close and continual ties of the Council of State with the administrative world of which it is completely a part, and with national life in general, are assured by many factors:

1. Future auditors are trained at the National School of Administration, in common with future high officials of all branches of the Administration (including the Court of Accounts).

2. Masters and regular councilors are recruited in various ways; the normal or career service is balanced by a direct influx of specialists of all sorts from outside the Council of State, and particularly from the most important branches of the Administration, in the broad sense of the term.

3. Advisory councilors, coming from different fields of national activity, play an important role in the four administrative sections, the General Assembly, and the Permanent Commission.

4. In every ministry there is an official (of at least directoral rank) who is designated by decree to participate in all meetings of the Council of State that deal with matters concerning his ministry. Moreover, officials of this rank may be designated by ministerial *arrêt* to take part in the discussions of the Council on any given matter.

---

[30] The plenary session for litigation is composed of the vice-president of the Council of State, the president of the disputes section, the presidents of its subsections, and four regular councilors elected from among the councilors assigned to the administrative sections (one from each section).

[31] In contrast to the rest of the *dossier*, which is not released to outside parties.

5. Ministers, and the vice president of the Council of State, may call upon individuals whose special knowledge would help to clarify the discussions to take part, with consultative vote, in the meetings of the General Assembly, the Permanent Commission, commissions, or sections (other than the litigation section).

6. A member of the Council of State is assigned to follow up matters of interest to the Council with the President of the government (Premier).

7. Members of the Council of State are detached or given leaves of absence to function in a public capacity, which gives them access to key posts in the Administration as well as to an important source of experience.

Thus the Council maintains a close contact with outside affairs in many ways; its *esprit de corps*, based on time-honored tradition and the prestige that surrounds it, does not isolate it from administrative life. While it is compartmentalized and forms a closed unit, it is nevertheless not entirely closed, but always keeps in close touch with the modes of thought and action fashioned by the necessities of practical life.[32]

The 1954 Reform. As of January 1, 1954, a major reform of the whole procedure for handling claims against the Administration has been enacted, radically transforming the traditional jurisdiction of the Council of State in these matters.[33] Before this reform, the Council of State was, in principle, judge of the first and last degree in administrative matters, while the "prefectural councils" were merely courts of first instance in specific cases. But a new division of jurisdiction had long been needed: indeed it had been requested by the Council itself. A combination of circumstances—the widespread confidence of the public in the Council's impartiality, together with a series of postwar crises which called for special legislation (e.g., the post-liberation "purge," requisitioning, war damage, the intervention of the government as a result of the nationalization in many fields, and problems posed by the new civil service statute) had resulted in a wave of new claims before the Council which created a most difficult situation. Since the litigation procedure before the Council takes on the average between three and five years, decrees of annulment are tardy, and have only a moral significance when they are issued—a situation which lends encouragement of a sort to illegality. The number of claims before the Council is constantly growing, but the General Assembly has not been increased in size for a century, and is responsible for several other functions as well as the consideration of claims.[34] As a result, it was obliged to make a desperate effort to prevent this flood of claims[35] from resulting in a lowering of the level of its decisions. Some means of speeding up the disputes procedure obviously had to be found. The government accordingly seized the opportunity offered by the July 11, 1953 law, which gave it temporary special powers that extended to a reform of administrative litigation.

---

[32] See the jubilee volume cited in note 2, especially the article by Henri Puget, pp. 113–17.

[33] Decrees no. 53–934, no. 53–935, no. 53–936, no. 53–937, all of Sept. 30, 1953.

[34] The Council of State has become, by force of circumstance, the center of many neighboring or new jurisdictions, among them the High Court of Arbitration, the Prize Court, the special commission for appeals concerning war pensions, the High Commission for appeals on war damage, the Commission of Appeal for refugees and stateless persons, and so on.

[35] The number of claims before the Council of State was as follows: 4,964 in 1938–39;

By this reform the 23 prefectural councils of metropolitan France,[36] as well as the prefectural councils in the seven overseas departments,[37] were transformed into *tribunaux administratifs*.[38] These tribunals are henceforth brought closer to the parties, since they replace the Council of State as first degree judge in administrative matters. The Council of State now assumes a triple function:

1. It is a court of ascription (*juge d'attribution*) for administrative litigation originating in extra-metropolitan territories,[39] or for cases directly submitted to it by law because of their presumed importance or because they concern several administrative tribunals.[40] In these special cases, the Council of State remains competent in first and last instances (an exception to the new general rule).

2. It is court of appeals from decisions of the administrative tribunals or other special jurisdictions of first instance.[41]

3. It is the supreme court (the only one in administrative matters) over all bodies having administrative jurisdiction from which there is no appeal to the Council of State. The *Cour des Comptes*, or the court of budgetary discipline, for example, falls under the Council's final jurisdiction in this way. Hence all administrative disputes, whatever their origin, are always liable to challenge

---

4,963 in 1945–46; 5,410 in 1946–47. The backlog of cases as of August 1, 1939 was 1,779 *dossiers;* as of August 1, 1947, 10,405 *dossiers*; and as of August 1, 1953, 24,510 *dossiers*.

[36] *I.e.*, the 21 interdepartmental prefectural councils, the prefectural council of the Seine (at Paris), and the administrative tribunal of Alsace and Lorraine (at Strasbourg).

[37] *I.e.*, the seven overseas prefectural councils: three in the departments of Algeria, and one each in French Guiana, Martinique, Guadeloupe, and Réunion.

[38] In the other French dependencies overseas (which do not fall under the Minister of the Interior, as do those mentioned in the previous note, but are under the Minister for Overseas France), the organization of administrative justice remains unchanged—that is to say, fairly diverse. In particular, in overseas territories and associated territories (those making up the "French Union") we find *conseils du contentieux administratif*—administrative litigation councils—which vary from the obsolete predominance of active administrators that we find in such councils in New Caledonia to those with a greater place reserved for the judiciary magistrates (Madagascar, Cameroons, Indo-China). In Morocco and Tunisia administrative litigation is dealt with in ordinary courts.

[39] Those which fall under the jurisdiction not of the Minister of the Interior, but of the Minister for Overseas France (see previous note).

[40] To this class belong, among others, disputes arising from governmental decrees (whether regulatory or individual), those dealing with the rights of civil servants (including the military), or those involving the interpretation or evaluation of the legality of administrative acts when the point at issue directly concerns the jurisdiction of the Council of State as *juge d'attribution*, as well as disputes against unilateral administrative acts whose field of application covers the jurisdiction of more than one administrative tribunal.

[41] Except when certain specialized administrative jurisdictions comprise a hierarchy of their own (*i.e.*, have their own judge of appeals): as for example the university councils (first resort) and the Higher Council of National Education (second resort).

before the Council of State either on appeal or as last resort. The latter is never excluded, no matter whether the law expressly provides for it, remains silent, or even expressly excludes all recourse.

Thus, since the beginning of 1954, the majority of claims in administrative matters have been channeled to the *tribunaux administratifs*[42] and not, as previously, directly to the Council of State. However, the latter retains control, at least in principle, over the entire field of administrative litigation, if only by the appeals route.[43] (One must not overlook, moreover, the practical importance of the fact that the Council of State acts as court of first resort in all disputes concerning the rights of civil servants.) The unification of the entire jurisprudence is assured by this ultimate participation of the Council of State, which may never be disallowed. Furthermore, under the ordinance of July 31, 1945, the Council of State retains the permanent power of inspecting all administrative jurisdictions, both in metropolitan France and overseas.[44] This authority permits the Council to exert a strong influence and unifying control over the activity and administration of all organs of administrative jurisdiction, as well as giving it an opportunity to complete the training of its personnel.

This functional reform was accompanied by certain procedural reforms. The traditional and inexpensive written procedure, which gives the judge directive powers and is based upon an open hearing, is retained. But a right to stay the proceedings[45] is given to the administrative tribunal of first instance, allowing it to prevent illegal action from taking place. However, this power remains exceptional[46] and the Council of State may revoke such injunctions by a process considerably shorter than the usual one. In addition, by these reforms the compulsory or optional services of attorney before organs of administrative jurisdiction are considerably extended. These services become compulsory for all appeals (*cassation*) before the Council of State as court of last instance,[47] as well as in general for all claims before any of the previously mentioned organs of administrative jurisdiction, except in a few specified cases.[48] The position of claimant before an administrative judge has not been made more difficult by these changes: petitioning for setting aside rulings *pour excès du pouvoir* remains available to all, without formality or compulsory representation by an attorney. Nevertheless, the role of the *avocat* in administrative litigation is henceforth very definitely increased, both when it is required and when it is optional, as it is in all other matters (in which no representative beside the *avocat* is now permitted,[49] at least in principle).

---

[42] The delimitation of the territorial jurisdiction of the new administrative tribunals is complex. The idea behind it was to make sure that the administrative tribunals in Paris would not be swamped as the Council of State was, in view of the fact that with the French administrative system set up the way it is, the central authorities are situated in Paris and have extended jurisdiction. Any simplified formula would certainly have resulted in the accumulation in Paris of a mass of litigation directed against administrative acts. In order to avoid this danger, the formula adopted was pluralistic: the principle of competence based on the residence of the author of the contested administrative act is modified by a series of supplementary provisions relating to the residence of the claimant (*e.g.*, in the matter of pensions), to the location of the goods (*e.g.*, in legal disputes pertaining to expropriation or public domain), to the site of the exploitation in question (*e.g.*, in economic and social disputes), by the place of execution of a contract, by the scene of an official's assignment, by the situs of the corporation in arrears, by the scene of the event causing damage, and so on. Territorial jurisdiction is thus primarily a function of the nature of the matter under dispute.

[43] It may be hoped that losing parties in disputes (above all the Administration itself) will not in the future abuse the ways of appeal open to them. Otherwise the Council of State may not long enjoy the release from pressure achieved in 1954 (with respect to future claims as well as litigation underway at the time), and new delays and new backlogs may call for new measures.

[44] This mission of inspection, confirmed and strengthened by the 1954 reform, is exercised, under the authority of the vice-president of the Council of State, by a councilor assisted by two other members of the Council, who make the rounds regularly.

[45] Such injunctions have been available to the Council of State since 1806, but under the decree of that year were to be used only in exceptional circumstances; even when allowed, the application of such injunctions was very limited.

By these reforms the legislature aims to secure for the new administrative tribunals the prestige which they need for their duties, in order that recourse to the Council of State by parties to litigation may be as few as possible. The same motivation underlies those provisions of the 1953 legislation which insure the high caliber of the members of these courts; their initial recruitment is practically the same as that of second-class auditors of the Council of State.[50] Unlike members of the Council of State, who are—from the administrative viewpoint—under the Minister of Justice, members of these courts[51] are under the Minister of the Interior, although the decrees appointing them must be countersigned by the Minister of Justice. They are no longer under the authority of the prefect of the department in which the court sits, as were the prefectural councilors before the reform. Three out of four nominations for the higher posts in these courts are reserved for career councilors (who are on permanent duty with administrative tribunals), the fourth being available for administrative officials whose legal studies are completed, upon approval by a special commission.[52] In this way a certain exchange of personnel between the Council of State[53] and the administrative tribunals is assured.[54]

---

[46] Cases involving the maintenance of order, security, or the public peace, in which immediate execution would appear indispensable in the public interest, cannot be submitted to injunction. In the absence of any summary procedure (a provisory decision not basically breaking new legal ground, but intended only to forestall an irreparable prejudice), a certain extension of the injunction upon action by the 1954 reform—although always by way of exception—constitutes a partial correction of the non-suspending effect of the claim before administrative jurisdictions.

[47] Although the services of attorney, which are obligatory for claims before the Council of State as court of last instance, may be exercised only by members of a special bar (the *avocats au Conseil d'État et à la Cour de Cassation*, located in Paris), those before all other administrative jurisdictions may be exercised by all *avocats* in general, as well as by *avoués* (the latter are excluded from pleading).

[48] *Recours pour excès du pouvoir*, disputes on pension matters, individual litigation concerning civil servants, litigation which before January 1, 1954 would have been under the jurisdiction of the prefectural councils sitting as courts of first instance, and, finally, litigation under Council of State jurisdictions which, before the same date, had not required these services.

[49] In short, there is a virtual monopoly of representation, parties to disputes being able to call for the benefit of judicial assistance and to request the designation, if need be, of an *avocat d'office.*

[50] They must also have graduated from the National School of Administration, although they need not have taken first place in their respective groups; their training is completed by a period of probationary service with the litigation section of the Council of State.

[51] The members of the administrative tribunals are divided as follows: one president of the administrative tribunal in Paris; three section presidents and 14 councilors of the same tribunal; 28 presidents of administrative tribunals (in the provinces); and 81 councilors (23 of the first class and 58 of the second).

The Jurisprudence of the Council of State. We may now attempt to characterize briefly the general tenor of the Council of State's jurisprudence. It may be said to represent a conscious balance between the requirements of effective administrative action and principles of legality in the broadest sense, founded as much upon respect for written law as upon custom or equity. The Council of State constantly seeks a sort of reasonable synthesis of these often contradictory ideas: while safeguarding the public good, it nevertheless strives to maintain individual rights and liberties to the extent that they are not opposed to the interest of the community.

Thus, on the one hand, French administrative jurisprudence is able to respect the demands of administrative action without curbing it by pedantic formalism or even by the outright impact of legal control over administrative expediency. In practice the Administration remains free—within the framework of the law—to decide if, when, and how it must act in a given situation to best adapt its intervention to the particular conditions of each case. Except for cases where there is a direct legislative provision regarding this power to act or to refrain, the administrative judge in no sense imposes a "legal bureaucracy" upon the regular Administration. His role is to control, not to administer. Moreover, the Administration enjoys certain privileges which are recognized by administrative jurisprudence as necessary to its work, namely, the "preliminary privilege" (*privilège du préalable*)[55] and that of "spontaneous action" (*action d'office*). These privileges are so sweeping that in exceptional cases, on the occasion of extraordinary circumstances or of "*force majeure*," it countenances certain extra-legal powers of the Administration which permit it to exceed the authority conferred by legislative statute, thus allowing the administrative judge to modify the content of the law *extra* and even *contra legem* (the so-called "war powers" theory[56]). Finally, in the field of administrative responsibility for offense, administrative jurisprudence establishes a sort of hierarchy of offenses according to their gravity, as against the nature of the services in question, based on a differentiation between "personal offense" and "operational offense." All in all, the Council of State preserves a remarkable moderation, seeing to it that the Administration is not hindered by a minutely detailed and burdensome judicial control.

---

[52] This commission—on which representatives of the Ministry of Interior are in a minority—is presided over by the State councilor who is head of the inspection mission for administrative jurisdictions (see note 44).

[53] Some members of the Council of State are recruited from among the members of the administrative tribunals, for example, while masters from the Council of State may be named "for outside duty" as president of an administrative court or as councilor to the administrative court in Paris.

[54] The administrative courts are also consultative bodies: prefects may request their advice, just as the Government may request the advice of the Council of State. However, the function of the administrative courts is essentially the settlement of litigation.

[55] The possibility, in the field of explicit legislative dispositions, of taking executory decisions without previously addressing the judge, who is called into the case by the administree only if he denies the claim of the administration.

On the other hand, the Council of State pushes the control of legality quite far, never hesitating to annul administrative acts which run counter to the general principles that it considers an independent source of the law. Although they have no direct basis in legislation, these principles are not an arbitrary invention, a mere improvisation of the Council, but rest always upon certain tangible data. They reflect the law latent in the guiding rules of jurisprudence, whose stability results from the great prudence of the judge and his sense of reality imposed by practical necessities. This source of law receives much greater emphasis in administrative jurisprudence than in civil, and its role in the conceptual scheme of the administrative judge is more important, even quantitatively. The Council of State displays a similar tendency in regard to the constant extension of control over facts. It pursues its investigation of each case vigorously in order to bring out the antecedents of the cause, to weigh the precision of the evidence, to censure errors, to verify motives, and to limit patiently but relentlessly the discretionary sphere of the Administration. The Council tends, on the one hand, to extend the area of its control as much as possible. For example, acts beyond its jurisdiction by virtue of their intrinsically political nature (the so-called *actes de gouvernement*) are, by a characteristic evolution, steadily being reduced to those which relate either to France's foreign relations, or to the relations of the Government with the houses of Parliament.[57] On the other hand, the Council consciously extends the notion of administrative wrong-doing (granting the right to take legal action against the Administration for its acts) by interpreting the criterion of "self-interest" (which the claimant must establish for litigation) to include taxpayers, electors, members of a corporation, inhabitants of a commune, heads of families, shopkeepers and businessmen, landowners, civil servants in general, and so on.

In such ways as these, the Council develops a distinctive approach. Its particular conception of legal technique and of the principles of administrative law in turn react upon the opinions rendered by the administrative sections of the Council, and on legal theory. Around these general lines of thought, which find expression in the Council's *arrêts*, are created, by a continuing process, the general notions and doctrines which are developed from particular cases. One finds obvious traces of the influence of these trends in every corner and section of French administrative law as well as in the grand outlines of its doctrines.

---

[56] This theory, which is by no means limited to wartime events, but embraces all exceptional circumstances (*périodes critiques*) as well, is entirely of judicial origin. Certain administrative decisions which would be illegal in normal times thus become legal by virtue of certain circumstances.

[57] Administrative bodies serving Parliament are grouped with the legislative bodies *sensu stricto;* their acts thus may not be attacked before the Council of State.

Since we cannot fully explore the subject in such a brief study, we shall now review only the most striking legal developments introduced by the Council of State since 1945, in order to give the reader a concise picture of the general lines of the recent evolution of French administrative jurisprudence.

1. It appears to be firmly established by the Council's decisions between 1903 and 1920 that the field of application of administrative law in France is that of the *services publics*. Although this principle has never been anything but an approximation in view of the many exceptions which it has sustained since its first appearance,[58] it seemed nonetheless to have had some validity. As developed chiefly by Duguit and Jèze, this notion of "public service" has been the generally-accepted criterion for distinguishing the extending field of administrative law from that of the civil law applied to administrative activity, as well as for distinguishing the competence of the Council of State from that of ordinary courts. Thus all cases involving public officials and private citizens and arising from the execution, non-execution, or faulty execution of the public services, have been traditionally considered as falling under administrative jurisdiction and hence as depending, in the absence of a special law, upon the Council of State as administrative judge.

But in recent years this situation has been changed considerably by the government's assumption of functions that formerly were left completely or in large part to private enterprise. Particularly important has been the government's entry into the so-called commercial and industrial services, a development obviously accelerated by the nationalization measures adopted since 1945. The applicability of private law to administrative activity, which was formerly considered exceptional in the light of this doctrine of "public service," has been greatly extended. There is developing a new symmetry between these rival spheres of law, both applicable to the Administration. There can no longer be any question, even in theory, of submitting the whole public sector to a specific and original administrative law; in recent judicial thinking it is now more a matter of weighing in each case the intrinsic nature of the relationship involved, with a view to determining its specific status. This opens new complications in drawing the line of demarcation—which was never too simple and definite anyhow—between the two legal systems and between the jurisdictions of these two hierarchies of organs exercising judicial control in the field. The Council of State and the *Tribunal des Conflits* take into consideration the nature of the juridical rules applicable to each litigation; they resolve such difficulties as arise by declaring in favor of an expedient solution, the result not of preconceived ideas but of the particular characteristics of given legal situations.

---

[58] Whether this notion is conceived in an "organic" sense, or in a "functional" sense.

Recent developments in administrative jurisprudence thus do not bear out the myth of a single governing idea in the administrative field, that of the "public service," nor yet the supposed tendency toward a juridical monism. Attractive as the idea of a special law for administrative matters has been, it could no longer resist the evolution of life itself and the new orientation of administrative activities consequent upon that evolution. The ordinary judge now enters the field of the control of administrative activity, to the extent that it is governed by private law. As a consequence, although administrative law has not ceased to be autonomous or to play an important part, it has lost its pretended theoretical monopoly in this field. This "return" to civil law has taken place in the public services of the state-planned economy, in the relationships of the commercial and industrial services with their consumers, in the new "professional law," and elsewhere. It has been endlessly debated on the theoretical level, but no scientific solution to replace the doctrine of the "public service" has yet been found. There is even talk of a sort of "crisis of administrative law" in France.

To the extent that the theory built upon the idea of "public service" has ceased to be considered the exact reflection of the contemporary situation in positive law, the Council's role as arbiter is only reinforced, in the absence of any previous principle of systematization in the subject matter. The Council rules upon the problem for each category of cases according to the shifting necessities of life. This should convince us that the whole question does not turn upon some theoretical construction, the product of judicial fancy; here, as in all other matters, the Council of State tries to find practical solutions based upon real needs. The administrative judge remains always the faithful interpreter of administrative necessities and does not recoil from abolishing the most beautiful theoretical schemes when they seem to him no longer to correspond to the requirements mentioned or to the shifting idea of the public interest.

2. The Council of State recognizes explicitly, in ever clearer fashion, certain general principles of law that it affirms, defines,[59] and never ceases to develop, even though it always respects the law in force. These general principles, actually created by the judges, tend to form a vast ensemble of rules persistently upheld by the Council.

a. The general principle of liberty, which inspired the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen, is still proclaimed and continues to be maintained in an ever-increasing number of aspects: liberty of conscience, freedom from all arbitrary exercise of power (for example, from restraint in the performance of legal acts), liberty of commerce and industry, and liberty of teaching.[60] Only the law can impose restrictions upon fundamental liberties or create an incapacity.

---

[59] We are dealing here with a new development in administrative jurisprudence, because the Council of State did not, before 1945, have recourse to general principles of law clearly recognized as such. The Council of State now speaks of them in precise fashion and places these principles on the same level as written law (they yield only to explicit dispositions of the latter).

b. The principle of the equality of all before the public services (especially in the matter of taxation) is constantly proclaimed in all its forms,[61] of which we may mention the following: equality of all, irrespective of race and religion or sex; equality governing the functions of the public services, having for corollary their neutrality; equality of the sacrifices that can be demanded of citizens or groups placed in the same situation; equality before taxation and the public tolls; equality of treatment for merchants engaged in similar activities; and of producers in the same category; interdiction of all privilege.

c. The principle of the non-retroactivity of laws and administrative acts—provided there is no explicit legislative disposition to the contrary and provided that these acts result in a modification of the administrative situation of the claimant. As a consequence, all retroactive measures are ruthlessly annulled by the Council of State, whether they deal with disciplinary or other matters.

d. The principle that any citizen injured in his rights or interests may institute proceedings to demand the annulment of an administrative act. The *recours pour excès de pouvoir* is thus considered to be *d'ordre public,* or generally available, even though no legislative statute expressly grants it against any and all administrative acts.

3. In the face of the steadily-multiplying encroachments of governmental activity into the sphere of private activities of the citizens, the Council of State, together with the *Tribunal des Conflits,* develops and enriches the "theory of assaults." On every occasion that the Administration, in the course of some practical activity, departs from its proper duties by committing some gross irregularity doing violence to the right of property or to a public liberty, the ordinary judge is exclusively competent. In other words, when the Administration resorts to procedures proscribed by jurisprudence, placing itself outside the law by a flagrant and manifest illegality, its act is *denaturé,* and is no longer subject to administrative law. In this situation the Administration falls under ordinary law and hence may be brought before an ordinary judge in the same way as any citizen. Means such as this are used to apportion judicial control of the Administration and to determine which law applies.

4. The Council of State has also taken account of the recent growth of a "professional power," that of the corporative public services. These professional groups, corporative in structure, constitute a sort of intermediary corps between the Administration and private organizations. Since 1940, the Council

---

[60] We may mention, for example, the oft-proclaimed liberty of local government bodies as over against central power, syndical liberty, freedom to choose one's work, freedom of the person from arrest, freedom of assembly (regulated by the laws in force, liberally interpreted by the Council of State), the responsibility of the state for administrative confinement in case of grave fault of the administrator, etc.

[61] But while the principle of liberty is absolute, that of equality may be abridged for the benefit of certain persons or their groups, if such abridgment is in the general interest.

of State[62] has extended its legal control to the activities of these new bodies, beginning with professional organizing committees,[63] and then taking in the newly created professional orders[64] (doctors, architects, dentists, veterinaries, accountants, surveyors, pharmacists, and the like). Its judicial rulings tend to assure a reasonable equilibrium between the professional organization and its members, maintaining that degree of liberty which can be reconciled with the demands of the profession (liberty of criticism, freedom of research, the realization of technical and scientific progress).[65] Thus a new and extremely important field for the activity of the Council of State has been discovered and is being extended.

The French Council of State will amply repay study by any student of comparative government, whether he be a political scientist or a jurist interested in public law. This unique institution may open new and perhaps unexpected horizons which he will find instructive and worthy of careful analysis. Such study can correct many superficial and hence inexact impressions of the French administrative regime and its legal system. It will certainly help one to understand the approach characteristic of French administrative law, an indispensable element in any thorough analysis. Nor is such study relevant only to the narrow field of this single national system, for it can provide a basis for understanding other administrative systems as well, including that of the student's own country. It furnishes the key to understanding the institutions of administrative law, born of the collaboration of administrative judge and legislator, a collaboration in which "legislative rule" is safeguarded, perhaps even occasionally supplied, by the "rule of the administrative judge." Together they insure that the democracy realized at the polls by the equal vote of each citizen is later preserved by his right to call the Administration to account before a competent and impartial judge.

---

[62] The Council of State has long remained faithful to the individualist principles of the French Revolution, opposing any tendency to *socialisme municipal.*

[63] These committees were dissolved by law in 1946.

[64] The new professional orders have absorbed the syndicates in the liberal professions thus organized.

[65] In this manner the rights of the minority have been defended against all corporative arbitrariness, against abuse of organization, against restrictions on liberty not derived from obligations which bind to a given profession (although prescribed by the corporative codes of professional ethics), as does the autonomy of private law against the extension of professional regulations, etc.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF POLITICAL PARTIES IN WESTERN NIGERIA

PETER C. LLOYD

West African Institute of Social and Economic Research, Ibadan, Nigeria

Among the various forms of indigenous political activity in Africa today, that of the nationalist parties of the British West African colonies is perhaps the most prominent. In the Gold Coast and Nigeria these parties have almost achieved self-government for their territories; they now form the government or opposition parties in elected parliaments. They should be clearly distinguished from other types of nationalist movements, such as nativistic uprisings or syncretist movements of religious or tribal associations.[1] As Coleman says: "African nationalism is not merely a peasant revolt. . . . Where it is most advanced [it] has been sparked and led by the so-called detribalized, Western-educated, middle-class intellectuals and professional Africans; by those who in terms of improved status and material standards of living have benefited most from colonialism; in short, by those who have come closest to the Western World but have been denied entry on full terms of equality."[2] Many of the members of these nationalist parties had, in their acceptance of a European style of life, turned their backs on the politically inert peasant mass from which they had risen, although in recent years there has been a growing interest on the part of the intellectuals in indigenous culture and history. In other parts of the world, such parties achieved power through revolution; in West Africa, the British colonial governments, in collaboration with these parties, drew up new constitutions and the party members were elected to power by ballot. To retain power the politicians have had to take party politics to the smallest towns and villages, where even nationalism had scarcely existed.[3]

The task, in a backward country, of a government which seeks to raise the living standards of its people largely by their own efforts, is certain to be difficult; its legislation cannot but be unpopular. The nationalist party, founded by the intellectual groups, often has little initial mass support from the people. To win such support without jeopardizing its program is its problem.

Analysis of the development of such political activity in the less advanced areas of Africa is so rare that a comparative study is not possible. In the Gold Coast and Nigeria the structure and organization of each party is unique. In

---

[1] For an excellent survey of these forms of political activity, see James S. Coleman, "Nationalism in Tropical Africa," this REVIEW, Vol. 48, pp. 404–25 (June, 1954).

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 414.

[3] Guided perhaps by the successful transfer of power in India, the British West African colonial governments met nationalist demands with offers of new constitutions. Some of these constitutions were barely functioning before they were superseded, but in this way outbreaks of violence, particularly such as spread to the masses, were almost completely prevented.

Nigeria the Action Group of the Western Region may be compared with the Northern Peoples' Congress of the Northern Region and the National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons, which flourishes in both the Eastern and the Western Regions.[4] Such parties may operate as mass parties appealing directly to the people to throw off colonial rule or they may operate through local organizations and exploit local grievances. The differences in these parties may be traced to the social structure of the country, to the past history of the party, and, where its history is short enough, to the personality of its leader. Here the development of party political activity will be considered in one area, that of the Yoruba people of the Western Region of Nigeria, where the Action Group and National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons are the chief protagonists.

The Yoruba people are dominant in this Region, where they number almost five million.[5] Characteristic of their settlement pattern are the many large towns: Ibadan, the Regional capital, has a population of nearly 500,000; there are three other towns (excluding Lagos, the Federal capital) whose population exceeds 100,000; and twenty-two others with populations between 20,000 and 100,000. These towns are tribal creations which existed long before the arrival of the British.[6] Within them the people are still grouped according to their tribal lineage. British rule and economic development have resulted in little displacement of population; only a small proportion (rarely above 10 per cent and in most towns less than five per cent) of the inhabitants of a town are strangers whose birthplace is in another town. The remainder continue to live in the compounds of their own lineage, to participate fully in the affairs of their kinsfolk, and to belong to the traditional age societies. New forms of social grouping are weakening these tribal forms but the latter still strongly persist.

The Yoruba are today the wealthiest people in Nigeria; their prosperity stems directly from cocoa farming. A recent survey of the national income of Nigeria estimates the average per capita income in the Western Region as £32 per annum;[7] but this is the regional average and the majority of the Yoruba, living within the cocoa belt, would have incomes double this figure. Three-quarters of the men are still farmers; 10 per cent are traders and clerks in trading firms and nearly 10 per cent are craftsmen. Some of the traders—the cocoa buyers and lorry owners—are wealthy men with incomes above £1,000 per annum. The degree of literacy is not high; compulsory primary education is just beginning. The Yoruba town offers little employment to literates, so that many with primary education and almost all with secondary education leave home to find work in Ibadan or Lagos.

---

[4] Nigeria is at present divided into three Regions, each with its own legislature and government. Lagos, the Federal capital, is excluded from these Regions. For administrative purposes, Regions are divided into Provinces and these are in turn subdivided into Divisions.

[5] There are in addition approximately half a million Yoruba in the Northern Region. With the Hausa (Northern Region) and the Ibo (Eastern Region), they are one of the three main groups in Nigeria.

[6] Lagos became a British possession in 1861. In 1886, representatives of the Governor interceded in the tribal wars in Yoruba country and effected a settlement. In the following years, treaties of peace and friendship were signed with many Yoruba rulers. A British Protectorate was declared in 1901.

[7] A. R. Prest and I. G. Stewart, *The National Income of Nigeria 1950–1951* (London, 1953).

There are today great differences in wealth among the Yoruba, but most of this wealth has been gained by individual effort. The prosperous men have risen from the most humble origins and the descendants of the wealthy men of a generation ago are today humble men. Great prestige attaches to trading and those who rank highest in the towns are, after the traditional rulers, the wealthy traders. They are followed by those who have risen highest in the intellectual field and then by the more modest traders, the prosperous farmers, the craftsmen, and finally the poor farmers. The rapid mobility from poverty to wealth and from one occupation to another has prevented the development of class phenomena, that is, of hereditary status or class consciousness. Prestige is accorded to the man who achieves most, and such honors are open to all.

Two nationalist political parties vie for the support of the Yoruba—the National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons (N.C.N.C.), led by Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe ("Zik"), and the Action Group, led by Mr. Obafemi Awolowo. N.C.N.C. developed in the 1940's out of the Democratic party, one of the earlier and more radical large Lagos nationalist parties; the name of the late Herbert Macauley still carries an emotional appeal. The present leader, Dr. Azikiwe, a man now fifty years of age, is an Onitsha Ibo; he received his university education in the United States. He is a popular charismatic figure who can draw large crowds among the Yoruba in spite of his different tribal origin; his henchmen lead the masses in cries of "Zik," "Zik." But in spite of this appeal the party had, until 1951, little organization outside Lagos. To the Ibo, the N.C.N.C. is the main party, their own tribal party. The Yoruba attracted to it are the more radical elements. These include those who were, in the provincial towns, advocating self-government when the masses were still unaware of such aims, those who were "misfits" in their own society and rebelled against tribal elders or British administrators, and, at a higher level, those who had been to England and returned with left-wing political ideologies. The party has suffered in the past from lack of leadership; Dr. Azikiwe has always remained supreme but associated with him are often men of little ability. Continual rivalry for office is marked in this party, in which so many members seek to be professional politicians. Dr. Azikiwe is today a wealthy business man—the *West African Pilot*, the official organ of the N.C.N.C., and one of the leading African banks are his —and is aware of the need of his party to attract similar elements; this sometimes leads to conflict with the younger radical groups within the party.

The Action Group was founded only in 1950. Mr. Awolowo had long been associated with politics as a member of the Nigerian Youth Movement, another nationalist political party whose activities were confined largely to Lagos. In the mid-1940's he travelled to England to study law and on his return set up in Ibadan what soon became a highly successful practice. He became Secretary of the *Egbe Omo Oduduwa*, a Yoruba cultural organization formed by the intellectuals. Its aims were primarily to promote the study of the Yoruba language and history, to improve education, and similar social measures. From it the Action Group was formed as a political body. Mr. Awolowo has not been a popular figure in the same sense as Dr. Azikiwe; he is a most industrious man of the highest integrity to whom mass popularity has little appeal. He attracted to his party not only other successful lawyers or school teachers but also the support of wealthy business men. It is, however, perhaps too sweeping to describe the Action Group as the party of the "prosperous" and the N.C.N.C. among the Yoruba, as the party of the "frustrated." Rivalry for office does not characterize the Action Group; one reason for this may be the ability of Mr. Awolowo, contrasted with the personal charisma of Dr. Azikiwe; another reason is possibly the fact that acceptance of political office would mean, for many Action Group supporters, a reduced income. While the N.C.N.C., with its headquarters in Lagos, has attracted men who have almost completely severed their ties with their home towns, the members of the Action Group, based at Ibadan, are men whose business is often connected with their home town, who may take a part in the local government of their town, and who, even if they do not continually reside there, build a large house as a sign of their intention to spend their later years among their own people.

Yoruba Local Government and Its Politics. Local government and central government developed in Nigeria independently of each other. The latter grew up in Lagos, where the Legislative Council included both European civil servants and Nigerian business men and politicians. Control of the central government had been the prime aim of the Nationalist politicians. Local government grew out of the traditional councils of the Yoruba obas (kings) and chiefs which were used under the policy of Indirect Rule as the vehicles for British Administration. Some administrators hoped, in the 1930's, that the government of the traditional Yoruba kingdoms might be developed so that their rulers might form the central government of the country, thus eliminating the power of the Lagos politicians, a group for whom they had little sympathy. After the war, the demand for improved social services made constitutional changes at the central and local levels imperative. The Yoruba rulers remained largely illiterate and aged men, unable to discuss the necessary legislation, and power passed instead to the literate minority, a group rapidly becoming politically conscious.

The Yoruba town was, in the past, governed by an oba, elected from the ruling lineage by the chiefs, and his chiefs, who were either elected by the members of their lineages or had risen through the grades of title societies by election by their members and the payment of fees. The British administrators from the beginning of their rule retained this indigenous structure, which they found quite virile. They did of course make the obas subordinate to themselves and no longer to their chiefs, so that they became autocrats in their towns. The introduction of elected councillors in the 1930's and 1940's to these traditional councils arose from the frustration of the Administrative Officers, who found the aged and illiterate chiefs quite incapable of introducing modern social services to their town or even of appreciating their value. In this way were drawn into local government literate young men who were capable of working with the chiefs and who were accepted by them. Some of these men, often only one in each town, developed into local political leaders, and so long as they retained the support of the chiefs and did not attack them as did so many literates, their popularity remained high. In recent years the number of elected councillors has grown, as attempts are made to develop the councils into local government bodies of an English pattern. The Local Government Law of 1952, promulgated by Mr. Awolowo and his Action Group government, makes the standard ratio three elected councillors to one traditional member. While undoubtedly these new councillors will in time develop a sense of responsibility, their inexperience and low standards of literacy have seldom detracted from the power or prestige of the former political leaders. These senior councillors created in each town a new political élite working with, and not in opposition to the traditional rulers. Literates who were continually critical of their chiefs received almost no public support and were not elected to office.

In each town are local societies devoted to the "improvement of the town." Such Improvement or Progressive societies are usually formed of the young literate men (and in many backward towns this means those who have only recently left school); most are teachers or clerks. One of their prime objects is the extension of education, and money is often collected to help poor scholars. They also write petitions to the British administrators or to their local councils asking for improved social services. Branches are formed in other towns where members of the home town have settled. In some cases, as in Ekiti, associations are formed which include several towns; these are more powerful not only on account of their size but also because they include men of greater experience and ability. Often the first elected councillors were the leaders of these Improvement societies, but when they were able to express their views in other ways, they lost interest in the societies, which then operated but spasmodically. In very few cases did these societies form an opposition group in the town; they were the outcome of intense local patriotism, of the desire not only to develop the town but also to make it better than the next town.

Contact between the nationalist political parties and the Yoruba towns was slight. Lagos politicians scarcely ever visited them. One exception was the tour made by Dr. Azikiwe in 1947 when he was appealing for funds to take his delegation to London to press for constitutional changes. Such visits are remembered by people today, but most are inclined to view them simply as a means of getting money for a free holiday in England; none of the benefits which they were promised then were directly realized. In some towns a local secretary was appointed, but no subsequent meetings seem to have been held. Similarly in 1950, the secretary of *Egbe Omo Oduduwa*, Mr. Isaac Delano, toured the country to gain support for the society. Collections were taken at meetings and local branches formally instituted but these never met. In Ijebu Ode,[8] on account of its proximity to Lagos, there were branches of the Democratic party and of the Nigerian Youth Movement, but these were involved in local disputes rather than national ones, the nationalist party label being adopted to give them greater influence. The newspapers of the nationalist parties had little circulation in these towns. The *West African Pilot* had small sales, but the *Daily Service*—the organ of the Nigerian Youth Movement—was scarcely seen outside Lagos. In Ijebu Ode almost one adult male in five bought a daily newspaper, but in some of the backward towns the comparable figure was one in four hundred. In short, the policies of the nationalist parties had little currency outside Lagos.

---

[8] Ijebu Ode, a town of 28,000 people, is now sixty miles by road from Lagos. Its people are noted traders and those who lived for long periods in Lagos took part in its politics and stirred up some enthusiasm in their home town.

The mass of the Yoruba viewed nationalist politics as the attempt of a few ambitious men to get themselves well-paid government posts; this, to them, was the meaning of "self-government," an aim with which they had little sympathy. They held no dislike for the British Administrative Officer; often he was ignorant and his intrusion into local feuds was a further complication, but he was patently honest and unbiassed (in relation to local politics) and not working merely to amass money for himself. His idea of justice was appreciated and one could sometimes appeal to him against the decisions of local obas or chiefs. It was he who introduced most of the improved social services to the town. Finally, possession of its own Administrative Officer conferred prestige on a town. Conversely, the politicians were not highly regarded; many were men who had dropped most of their connections with their home town, except perhaps to join in local disputes for their own gain. They were regarded as the troublesome men who did not fit into local society. It was believed that their accession to power would result only in bribery and corruption, the enrichment of their own pockets, and the halting of economic progress. "How could men," it was asked, "who took no interest in the improvement of their own town, do any good for a country?" Self-government should be postponed so that the British could develop the country further, creating a larger stratum of intellectuals and wealthy men from whom a government might be selected; this was often the view of the struggling trader who hoped one day to reach the privileged stratum.

This apathy toward nationalist aspirations, together with the lack in most towns of even a small nucleus of party followers, was the barrier which the Action Group and the N.C.N.C. had to surmount. Their efforts may be considered in two stages: the first stage being that of drawing the local leaders into a party organization; the second, that of bringing inter-party conflicts to the people themselves.

The First Stage, 1951. Elections were held throughout the Western Region in August and September, 1951 to select men for the new House of Assembly in Ibadan, set up under the MacPherson constitution.[9] These elections were indirect; at the lowest level, men were chosen by acclamation in ward meetings presided over by the chiefs and these men together with the members of the Native Authority—the oba, chiefs, and leading councillors—sat as an Intermediate Electoral College. From this College were elected by secret ballot the members of the Final or Divisional Electoral College, where the new members of the House of Assembly were elected, each Division being entitled to from two to seven members according to its population.[10]

---

[9] The MacPherson Constitution, named after the Governor of the period, came into force after widespread discussion by the Nigerian people. Resolutions were sent in by local government bodies and political associations and these were debated, in turn, at the divisional, provincial, regional, and central level.

The political parties took to the field in April and May, only four months before the elections took place. In most towns each party held only one large open meeting. Dr. Azikiwe, for the N.C.N.C., visited Ado Ekiti in May; the meeting was unannounced, but the rumors of his arrival, together with the spectacle of a fleet of large American cars draped with party flags, produced an audience of 500 young men in the courthouse. Dr. Azikiwe was accompanied by a platform of party notables. These spoke on the advantages of self-government and of the need for improved social services in the town. After some well-organized singing of the party songs, 150 membership cards were sold at a shilling each and the purchasers exhorted to attend local branch meetings. Thirty people did present themselves a week later, but there seemed to be vagueness about the aims of the party, and after an attendance of three persons at the next meeting, the branch died. The Action Group sent two young field secretaries in a battered kit car; only a few people attended the meeting and the speakers were sharply criticized by two well-educated men for visiting the villages before the town, where policy *ought* to be made, and for not bringing Ekiti men to preach to their fellow countrymen; policies which suited the Ijebus (Mr. Awolowo's country-people) would not suit the Ekitis. This delegation left achieving hardly anything. Neither party sent a further delegation to hold an open meeting but later sent members to appeal privately to the obas for support. In other towns the contact with the party politicians was as slight as in Ado.

The explanations of the meaning of the election and its process were given by the British Administrative Officers, aided by numerous pamphlets produced by the Public Relations Office. For a period of two months these men toured every village, holding open meetings in market places, courthouses, and churches.

To most people the structure of parliamentary government, the qualities needed by its members, and their duties were incomprehensible. Their only solution was to appoint literate men—for these would understand better what it was all about—and to appoint men who could be trusted to stand by their home towns and to preserve their interests. At the primary and intermediate elections the majority of those elected were young men. In the more advanced districts with a number of teachers and clerks living at home or in nearby towns, these men predominated; in backward and often Moslem districts where local teachers are few, and where the literates, because of their small numbers and because, in many cases, of their mission education, are less accepted by their own people, the majority of those elected were traders and craftsmen. Those chosen to be members of the electoral colleges had no duty but to vote; their election gave them local prestige but little else. From the beginning, the discussion in the towns centered around those who would be finally elected to sit in Ibadan.

---

[10] I have given a fuller description of these elections and an analysis of the membership of the electoral colleges in "Some Comments on the Elections in Nigeria," *Journal of African Administration*, Vol. 4, pp. 82–92 (July, 1952).

The prime qualification necessary for those who aspired to election to the House of Assembly was a good record of service for their own towns in local government or in the sphere of education. Those who had sat on local councils and succeeded in persuading British Administrative Officers or missionaries to provide a new school or hospital were the men to be sent to Ibadan, where similar tasks were thought to await them. Several young men who returned to their home towns after long absences in Lagos, with claims of their experience, were held in very low esteem and lost their deposits. In most towns the choice was severely limited by the lack of educated men who had retained close ties with their home towns; many backward towns of the northern Yoruba had never even produced a man with a full secondary school education. Personal qualities figured largely; concerning some men there was more discussion of their moral character than of their political ability.

For the final election many candidates produced hand-bill manifestoes and a few even printed posters. These extolled the local record of public service of the candidates; men from Lagos described their professional qualifications and some gave detailed accounts of the improved social services they would demand, but their efforts were fruitless. Conspicuous by their absence were references to party allegiance. In Ado Ekiti one man cited himself as a member of the executive committee of *Egbe Omo Oduduwa;* another man, who eventually topped the poll, was a leading member of the Action Group, but he did not emphasize this and it was even alleged that such a party allegiance reduced the number of his votes. Also absent in the manifestoes were references to self-government or to the role of the British in the country.

At the Final Electoral Colleges it was noticeable that votes were almost invariably cast for candidates of one's own home town and for those of neighboring towns. There seemed to be little tendency for teachers to vote for teachers, traders for traders, or for any other form of preference based on wealth or education. Political activity at this stage was confined largely to the obas, who bargained with each other to ensure the success of the candidates from their own towns. The Action Group openly supported a few candidates in each Division but confined their canvassing to the obas. The N.C.N.C. tended to claim all the other candidates; in Ado Ekiti their leading candidate had attended a party meeting only once in his life!

Local Improvement societies provided a forum for discussing the issues raised, but few of them took sides. In the first place, they were ostensibly devoted to the progress of their own town and not interested in national politics. It also happened that candidates for both parties were their members and that to choose between them would have split the society.

This election resulted in sending to Ibadan not only the Action Group leaders, who had been elected in their home towns on the record of their interest in local affairs, but also a large number of men to whom, a year before, a seat in the House of Assembly would have been a fanciful dream. Many of the latter were men who had never taken any part in nationalist politics; their allegiance to the Action Group was little more than an expression of sympathy with the prosperous Yoruba traders and lawyers. Some of them had scarcely moved outside their own home town but were, within it, prominent councillors. When it was seen that the Action Group had won the election by a large majority, some Assembly men who had fought as Independents joined the party and a few even openly changed their allegiance from the N.C.N.C. to the Action Group. When the Action Group party first assembled at Ibadan, it contained a nucleus of active politicians, to whom went most of the ministerial posts, together with a large group of almost non-political members interested only in the welfare of their own towns. To the leaders fell the task of welding these into a group and instructing them in party discipline. For the support of their party, they contributed one tenth of their salaries to party funds.

The Second Stage, 1952–54. The first year of the new constitution was a quiet one in the Yoruba towns. The two political parties, the Action Group and the N.C.N.C., were developing their own internal structures. Some important legislation was passed, but the major enactment, that of the Local Government Law, was not completed until February, 1953. Although the bill was the subject of long debates both in the House of Assembly and the House of Chiefs, the discussion was not carried to the mass of the people. In fact when it came into operation several people who should have known better thought it was merely another reform by the British Administrative Officers. Members of the House of Assembly were supposed to give accounts of their meetings to their local people; some appear to have made reports to their local councils, but only occasionally, and the mass of the people remained ignorant of the working of their new government. Conversely, the political leaders do not seem to have felt the need to increase greatly their contact with the people.

Increased political activity came with the elections for local government councils, set up under the new law, which were first held in June, 1953 and are still proceeding as the law is implemented in each Division. The majority of councillors are returned unopposed, being selected long in advance of the election day at ward meetings presided over by elders. But where contests take place these have usually been along party lines, candidates using the party symbols for their ballot boxes. Political activity became considerably more intense as the elections (by secret ballot, direct vote, and adult male suffrage) approached for the Federal House of Representatives set up under the Revised Constitution. Today the Action Group members may be judged by their legislation, that which most directly affects the people being the increased taxation, the reduced status of the chiefs, and free primary education.

The development of party organization proceeded but slowly. Most of the activity stimulated in 1951 had, by mid-1953, completely died. At their Warri Conference in December, 1953, it was reported that the Action Group had 185 branches in 1951 but that in 1952 only 45 could be considered active and the stimulus of local government elections had raised this to only 81 by the end of 1953. Most Yoruba towns are represented by Action Group members of the House of Assembly and these are supposed to be the party leaders in their towns;

occasionally another local man, often a teacher, is nominally president or secretary of the local branch. Wealthy traders are often invited as presidents or patrons of branches, since they not only provide financial support but also lend the party their own high prestige in the town. Opposition parties also seek support by creating rivalry among the wealthy for such recognition. Branches of the N.C.N.C. are equally feebly developed in most towns. By 1954 the Ijebu Ode branch was well organized and conducting fairly regular open meetings; in Ibadan and Iwo, a large but relatively backward town twenty-seven miles from Ibadan, local political organizations, allied in the former case with the N.C.N.C., contested the local government elections in early 1954. But these were exceptions. Frequent public meetings, except at election time, were not common in either party. The Action Group meetings tended to be private cliques assembled in the house of the local member. Membership of both parties was by payment of a small annual fee, often only a shilling, and insofar as people had been canvassed they joined, but quite large towns numbered their party members in tens and rarely in hundreds. Local party leaders complained that members had no conception of a duty to attend meetings. The local branches, having no secretariat, scarcely need funds for their own operation. Action Group funds came from the levy made on members of the House of Assembly and from the donations of wealthy business men. Their own central secretariat in Ibadan was in 1953 very small, consisting only of a party manager, an administrative secretary, and a field staff of three organizing secretaries and three Divisional secretaries (this for a Region with a population of 6,500,000 persons). In June, 1953 a Fighting Fund was launched to collect £150,000 to build a permanent secretariat and for other developments; this was a complete fiasco. At a few meetings rich men contributed large sums, some reaching £1,000 and more, but there was no organization which could raise money from the rest of the people.

Links between local party branches and the central party organization are weak. Most local branch secretaries, when questioned, seem to have no regular channel of communication with their leaders; some have only the most vague ideas about party policy, which reading the party newspaper would soon correct. Even at election times the Action Group has seemed unable to provide its branches with literature either for general distribution or even for educating the local party members. The work of the N.C.N.C. leaders often seems confined to arbitrating in disputes in their local branches.

While the development of party organization scarcely affected the people, the Action Group legislation did. The accession to power of an African government meant little, in practical terms, for most of the people; neither was there any quick reform which such a government could promote to free the people from such burdens as landlordism or indebtedness. Increased social services could be provided only if increased taxes were paid and in many areas the flat rate of tax, together with local rates, rose from 15/- to 30/- per adult male. (In the previous twenty-five years of British rule taxation rates had remained almost stationary). In many areas this tax was collected in three stages—the new health and education levy, the flat rate, and the assessment tax—so that men were being pestered for money for almost six months. Action Group legislation has also reduced the numbers of chiefs sitting on local councils, and reforms of the native courts, substituting a trained man for a bench of illiterate chiefs, are being considered. With these changes chiefs will probably lose their incomes and with so little financial inducement to men to take titles, chieftaincy may lapse.

These issues do not divide the people into sharply opposed groups. Most educated men realize that social services can be provided only by increased taxation; the mass of the people object to paying this tax. The tax is graduated only slightly, so that wealthy men pay a scarcely higher percentage of their income in taxes than the poorest. The poorer groups are thus hardest hit by the new tax, but this is rarely mentioned in opposition propaganda. Similarly, while many people would admit that the aged and illiterate chiefs are not competent to carry out the modern duties of local government and judicial courts, any measure which threatens chieftaincy raises a universal emotional opposition.

It naturally takes time for any government to produce economic changes apparent to the people. After two years of rule, only the politicians with large salaries and opulent American cars (for which they received loans in the manner of government employees) seemed, to the masses, to have benefited. Business men who supported the Action Group were seen to be in receipt of large government loans; most of these were in fact issued before the Action Group came to power and merely illustrated the tendency for these men to support the party in power. "Life More Abundant," the Action Group party slogan, soon became an epithet of abuse to hurl back at the politicians.

These are the issues which make up most of the arguments used in party politics today; but since they do not divide the people, the split into opposing party groups in the Yoruba towns takes place along other lines.

In the recent local government elections, the majority of the seats have been uncontested; only in 34 wards out of a total of 279 did voting take place in Ijebu Remo Division in June, 1953 (this low figure will probably prove an exception with the present increased political activity). In the remaining wards the candidates were selected at meetings of the ward held in the compound of a chief. Most of these uncontested seats were held by the Action Group, the people not wishing to oppose the government. In some cases where the selected candidate was a member of the N.C.N.C. he quietly changed his allegiance to suit his people.

Where wards in Ijebu Remo Division were contested, the division appears to have been along the lines of a recent dispute over the succession to the throne of the oba. In Shagamu, the N.C.N.C. was led by a son of the late oba who had recently unsuccessfully claimed the throne, but who was highly popular. In Ikenne, the N.C.N.C. leader was also an unsuccessful claimant to the throne, the new oba having been installed through the efforts of Mr. Awolowo, himself a native of this town. Although these title disputes should, in theory, be settled by the chiefs and certain other performers of ritual, most members of the town take sides with the rival claimants, many supporting them financially during the conflict. In another town, recently the scene of a long title dispute, one of those who had opposed the installation of the new oba said that he had been invited by the N.C.N.C. to start a party branch in his town.

Tribal disputes cannot divide towns but they may determine the allegiance of a majority of the town. In Ibadan the local government elections were recently won by the N.C.N.C. not only because of their better organization in this instance, and of a reaction against the previous councillors, but also because of the traditional hostility between the Ibadan and Ijebu, the Action Group being described as a party of Ijebus. The Olubadan, ruler of the town, himself supported the N.C.N.C.

In most towns may be found a few young men—and even some elders—who seem by their temperament destined to lead an opposition, whatever its policy. How far these can create a party depends on their organizing ability. In the Iwo local government elections such a party was highly successful, winning a majority of seats in the town but none in the smaller towns and villages. This party was led by two men; one had been a government clerk who retired in his home town and because of his education and experience felt that he ought to improve its administration (an Administrative Officer probably suggested this to him as well); his efforts in the ensuing years seemed designed to prove the incompetence of the chiefs and the corruption of the councillors; he was distrusted by these and little respected by the mass of the people. The second man, much younger, has seen army service in the Middle East and is a highly intelligent man; his only offense was to seduce the wife of a co-worker, a most serious offense in Yoruba custom for which he will perhaps never atone. For several years he had been active in local politics, sometimes forming new Improvement societies in opposition to the one dominant in the town. These two men by their superior organizing ability, aided only slightly by the N.C.N.C. leader in Ibadan, fought an election campaign using as their main issues taxation and chieftaincy. They were successful mainly in their own and neighboring wards and where the previous councillors had become most disliked. Whether they will be able to lead a party for a long period in addition to crystallizing the forces of opposition remains to be seen. In other towns the N.C.N.C. and other opposition parties are often led by similar men; some are well-educated men who have become frustrated by their failure to gain recognition in their own town; others are letter writers—semi-literates who earn a living by typing petitions and otherwise becoming involved in local disputes—who are persons of little prestige as a group and who seem to have been responsible for many short-lived societies in their towns.

These points were well illustrated by the elections held in November, 1954 to the Federal House of Representatives. In the Yoruba Provinces, the Action Group and the N.C.N.C. each polled approximately 50 per cent of the votes cast. This election differed from earlier local government elections: the constituencies were much larger—averaging 150,000 persons each—and personalities played a relatively smaller part. The election was a straight fight between the two parties, the main issues being the legislative record of the Action Group. In many areas the sentiment created by local opposition leaders was so great that a N.C.N.C. candidate was elected in spite of his personal unpopularity. That the Action Group polled so few votes came as a surprise to their leaders. Considerable sums of money had been spent on loudspeaker vans and on employing party secretaries in the major towns. The success of the N.C.N.C., however, was not, as most of their leaders claimed, due to their superior policy or organization. In the Yoruba towns their candidates won where the local branches had little or no contact with the party headquarters; they fought the elections with the most limited financial resources; they had little policy but that of opposition.

In the months following the election, neither party gave signs of learning the lessons that it contained. The Action Group secretariat dismissed many of its workers and the local branches continued to consist of cliques of the more prosperous men. The N.C.N.C. has failed to take advantage of the evident unpopularity of its opponent by making more and stronger contacts with its local party branches, though the latter, heartened by their success, have retained much local power.

In this election the Action Group was attacked for the rise to wealth of its leaders and for the loans and contracts believed to be the rewards of its supporters. As a result the Action Group is increasingly regarded as a party of the rich, while the N.C.N.C. champions the common man.

Party Politics Today. The political parties of the Western Region of Nigeria are still in a very early stage of their development. Their organization grows with every election to local, Regional, or Federal government and their progress since 1951 is sufficient indication of their rate of development. Both the Group and the N.C.N.C., especially the former, are caucus parties.[11] The caucus is a select group of notables wielding great influence. The Action Group leaders attracted to their party not only the new political élite in the Yoruba towns who were elected to the House of Assembly in 1951, but also the obas who sit in the House of Chiefs. Almost all of these support the Action Group if for no other reason than that to oppose would be suicide; N.C.N.C. members are now claiming to support the obas and chiefs but they are often men who have consistently opposed them in the past, while the Action Group local councillors have in some cases recently improved the salaries of their own oba and chiefs. The local politicians and the obas have the support too of many of the local business men. Thus the Action Group is supported by a greater part of those whose prestige ranks highest in the town. The N.C.N.C. on the other hand, since becoming the opposition party, has endeavored to foster the discontented elements in each town and often contains an ill-mixed assortment of educated doctrinaire left-wing nationalists, letter writers, and title claimants. Many of these local party groups claiming membership of N.C.N.C. have, in fact, very few links with the headquarters of the party. Some of them, however, have a well-developed local organization; officers are appointed, membership fees regularly collected, and some discipline exercised over would-be candidates at election times. Such organization reaches its peak with election activity.

Yoruba social structure does not contain divisions of a conventional politico-economic nature; neither is there much indication that the rival parties would, in power, pursue markedly different policies. Traditional social groupings into lineages and wards are still virile and it is at meetings of these that the local councillors have been chosen. One party newspaper recently claimed that the task of the party leaders was not to preach to the masses but to pick the likely winners among the candidates and draw them into the party. For the politicians, however, parties are today a necessary part of their organization. The opposition parties must stimulate feeling against the party in power if they are to succeed at the next election. The Action Group, in face of the unpopularity of some of their legislation which has already caused rioting, must build up more mass support in the towns.

---

[11] One of the categories used by Maurice Duverger in his *Political Parties, Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State*, tr. North (New York, 1954).

At election times, therefore, old factions in the towns are revived; the opposition criticizes the Action Group for its taxation and for its policy towards the obas and chiefs. It abuses its members for making of national politics merely a lucrative occupation for themselves. At many elections, however, the propaganda degenerates into exchanges of proverbs based on the symbols used by the respective parties.

The creation of such party political divisions is causing some apprehension. The government of the Yoruba town has, by tradition, the duty of maintaining peace and harmony. When chiefs came to a decision it was always a unanimous one. An oba was judged by the manner in which he settled differences, and however acrimonious a title dispute might be, the early efforts of the new holder were to reconcile his opponents by entertaining them with kola nuts and receiving their allegiance. Political elections are often deplored by the elders when these reopen old disputes and every effort is made to settle the contest at a traditional meeting where an ostensibly unanimous decision may be reached.

The leadership of the town by the oba and by the more influential councillors is weakened. Those local leaders who were elected to the House of Assembly have lost much prestige; they were sent to Ibadan to get social services for their own town and yet the most noticeable result of their activity is higher taxation. Many of those of poorer education were not even able to make eloquent speeches on behalf of their constituents. Several such members, being faced with the rival claims of loyalty, to their town or to their party, have on occasions chosen the former and have done little to urge the acceptance of their party's legislation in their own towns, thus throwing the whole burden on a few party leaders who have, in the past two years, spent much of their time campaigning throughout the Region. The obas can disclaim direct responsibility for legislation but their allegiance to a party often prevents them from taking a leading part in local issues; many of them seriously need the popular support that such activity would give them. Most obas take sides during elections and a few campaign energetically if secretly. This earns them the criticism of the politicians opposed to them, which further weakens their position in the town, where such political roles are not generally accepted. A town permanently divided into rival political groups means a slow adjustment in the roles of the oba and chiefs and of the élite of the town. Through the declining popularity of this élite, the Action Group leaders are seriously weakening their main link with the mass of the people.

In spite of its policies, which have done little to bring immediate benefits to the poorer people, the Action Group still enjoys the support of a large part, perhaps of the majority, of the Yoruba people. This is partly because it commands the allegiance of the obas and the local élites; partly because the various opposition groups seem incapable of providing a stable government; but largely because it is the party in power. There is little evidence of corruption among the Action Group leaders yet the belief exists among the mass of the people that only party supporters will get anything done for them. Business men join the party so that their applications for government loans may not be jeopardized; one such man started organizing a local branch when he thought that his loan application was due for consideration; when it was refused, his party activity ceased and he became a critic once more! Local government councils are anxious to display their party allegiance by votes of confidence and resolutions on national issues far outside their competence, for it is felt that a Ministry of Local Government will ignore all pleas from a council with an opposition majority. In one recent election the main Action Group theme was that only its own councillors would be able to get anything done. Young men who help organize local party branches often do so only in the belief that they will be immediately rewarded with well-paid posts in the party secretariat. These are delusions, yet they have a powerful hold on the minds of the people.

The main outline of the development of political parties in Western Nigeria may be briefly recapitulated. Nationalist politics started in Nigeria in Lagos, where the parties were led by the rising intelligentsia, who aimed to throw off the yoke of British Imperialism. When political power was given to the mass of the people, it was the Action Group that gained the overwhelming support of the Yoruba. Its leaders were the Yoruba élite—prosperous lawyers, teachers, and business men; it was a party confined largely to Yoruba and hence able to play on tribal sentiments. It won the support of the traditional rulers and of the local élites of the provincial towns. Those who were successful at the elections it welded into a parliamentary party. The Action Group has continued to maintain its contact with the people through the obas and its wealthy supporters. It has claimed to support the obas and chiefs (though with little justification) and has benefited the more prosperous section of the community; but the obas have lost much of their charismatic authority through interfering in party politics, and the members of the local élite have lost respect through failing to produce the promised benefits for their town, presenting their people instead with higher taxation. This discontent has been canalized locally by several opposition leaders, but has yet to be effectively exploited on a Regional scale. Successive elections at local, Regional, and Federal levels have maintained a continuous interest in party politics—with the result that the Action Group is beginning to be widely regarded as a party of the prosperous men. That some towns have developed into N.C.N.C. strongholds is, however, due not so much to the peculiar social or economic structure of their populations as to local personalities, their feuds and loyalties. How far such development is typical in African societies is a subject which merits more study.

THE NEW ZEALAND LABOR PARTY*

LOUISE OVERACKER
Wellesley College

I

The New Zealand Labor party came into being after years of indecision and disunity, and many false starts. The history of this movement lies outside the scope of this article, but a brief discussion of the basic cleavages which divided labor before 1916, and of the circumstances under which the party was organized, may help to clarify some of the points in the analysis of its present-day structure and problems which is attempted in the pages ahead.

The geography and economy of New Zealand encouraged small, widely scattered productive units and decentralized unions relatively weak in bargaining power. The economy is dependent largely upon agriculture and the earlier industries were concerned chiefly with the processing of primary products such as butter, cheese, and meat. The thinly scattered population,[1] the remoteness of the "four main centers" (Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch, and Dunedin) and many of the provincial towns, the variations in conditions from locality to locality, and the absence of mass production industries discouraged the development of a cohesive labor movement ready to support its demands by unified industrial action. Among those groups of workers who were thrown together on the job, such as the "watersiders" (dockworkers) and the miners, there was greater solidarity than among others and these were more inclined to press their claims by direct action.[2] The trades and labor councils that developed in the various centers and met in Dominion-wide annual congresses after 1891 were the stronghold of the more moderate unions. Periodically their tactics were challenged by the militant groups, and differences crystallized in the formation of rival organizations.

---

* The field work for this study was made possible by a Guggenheim fellowship and a leave of absence from Wellesley College in 1951–52. The writer wishes to take this opportunity to thank the John Simon Guggenheim Foundation and Wellesley College for their assistance. It is a pleasure, also, to express appreciation to the officers and members of the New Zealand Labor party and others who aided in the study, and to acknowledge the assistance of R. M. Chapman, Robert S. Parker, and Ormond Wilson, whose criticisms of the initial draft were invaluable. Before this manuscript was revised, the writer had the benefit of reading an article by John Penfold, Assistant Lecturer in Political Science, University of Otago, which appeared later under the title "The New Zealand Labour Party: Formal Structure," in *Political Science* (N.Z.), Vol. 6, pp. 3–16 (March, 1954).

[1] In 1871, 254,928; in 1881, 487,889; in 1891, 624,455; in 1901, 770,304; in 1911, 1,005,585; and in 1921, 1,214,677. These figures are exclusive of Maoris.

[2] For a good, brief description of the New Zealand economy see Horace Belshaw, "Economic Organization," in Belshaw (ed.), *New Zealand*, United Nations Series (University of California Press, Berkeley, 1947). The best description of the industrial movement is A. E. C. Hare, *Report on Industrial Relations in New Zealand*, published for Victoria University College (Wellington, 1946). Although completed almost ten years ago, this evaluation is in the main still valid. There is no full-length study of the New Zealand labor movement but the following are helpful: J. D. Salmond, *New Zealand Labour's Pioneering Days; The History of the Labour Movement in New Zealand from 1840 to 1894* (Auckland, 1950); D. W. Crowley, "New Zealand Labour Movement, 1894–1913" (Otago University Honors thesis, 1946); and the shorter version of this thesis in "Outline History of the New Zealand Labour Movement, 1894–1913," *Historical Studies, Australia and New Zealand*, Vol. 4, No. 16. The *Maoriland Worker*, published by the "Red Fed" after 1910, is a valuable source.

The most serious challenge to the leadership of the trades and labor councils came from the Federation of Labor, organized in 1909. Better known as the "Red Fed" it adopted the I.W.W. slogan, "The World's Wealth for the World's Workers," proclaimed the class war from the housetops, and spread the twin doctrines of industrial unionism and direct action.[3] A major issue between the "Red Fed" and the trades councils was the arbitration system. In the election of 1890, local labor groups had joined the Liberals in turning the Conservatives out of office, and the impressive program of legislation enacted under the Liberal-Labor alliance that followed had included the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1894. Inaugurating a system of compulsory arbitration designed to protect the weak from exploitation, this act, with important amendments is still in operation. From the outset some viewed it as "Labour's leg-iron,"[4] but although there had been much dissatisfaction over specific awards, the trades and labor councils remained loyal to arbitration as a system and to political action as a method. In the struggles which followed the organization of the "Red Fed," militancy was crushed and the organization's leaders, convinced that direct action could not succeed until there was more class consciousness and solidarity among the workers, eventually joined the moderates in forming the present party in 1916. Nevertheless, there remains a strain of militancy and political agnosticism which rebels periodically against the arbitration system and the tactics of the moderates. During the years after the First World War, when wages failed to keep pace with living costs, the Trades and Labor Council was challenged by an Alliance of Labor, organized on industrial lines, and the competing groups were not merged into the present New Zealand Federation until 1937.

Disagreements over industrial matters were sharpened by the introduction of compulsory unionism after the Labor government came to power. Since 1936, all workers employed in an industry covered by an arbitration award must belong to the union. A powerful sanction behind these awards is the threat of deregistration and the provision that any 15 workers may apply to register a new union. Recalcitrant groups may find themselves threatened with rivals under more conciliatory leadership, and may even face the unpleasant alternative of joining the new union or leaving the industry. Militants maintain that reluctant unionists are not good unionists, that compulsory unionism has sapped the movement of its vitality, and that unions are run by self-perpetuating oligarchies. They also argue that compulsory unionism throws control of the Federation of Labor into the hands of clerks and shop assistants with a middle-class orientation, and that the Federation follows an overly cautious policy in industrial matters. Something of the "Red Fed" tradition survived in the militancy of the groups which attempted to organize a breakaway Trade Union Congress in 1950, and in the following year precipitated the most serious industrial upheaval New Zealand had experienced for a generation.

---

[3] For a graphic account of this movement by one of its leading spirits, see P. H. Hickey, *"Red Fed." Memoirs: Being a Brief Survey of the Federation of Labour from 1908 to 1915*, New Zealand Worker Print, 1925.

[4] This expression was used by H. E. Holland, the first leader of the present Labor party.

The party that was formed in 1916 brought together groups which had been as sharply divided over political tactics and social objectives as they had been over industrial policy. As we have seen, labor turned to the ballot-box in 1890, and local labor groups had helped the Liberals to defeat the Conservative government in that year.[5] For more than a decade Labor was a very junior partner in an informal Liberal-Labor alliance. During these years the annual conference of the trades and labor councils was the only gathering which could claim to represent the movement throughout the Dominion and it discussed policy, passed resolutions, and sent deputations to parliament. As the economic position of the workers worsened, and Labor's close association with the Liberals became less profitable, there was pressure within the trades councils for an independent Labor party. For a variety of reasons this movement met stubborn resistance; a series of attempts to launch an independent party under the *aegis* of the trades and labor councils, made between 1906 and 1913, failed to command united support.[6]

In the meantime the banner of independence had been raised by a small group of Socialists who, from 1900 on, preached the Marxian doctrines of the class struggle and social revolution. Although the "Red Fed" put its faith in industrial rather than political action, many of its leaders were identified with the Socialist party, the programs of the two organizations were very similar, and the *Maoriland Worker*, which was the official paper of the "Red Fed," carried on a vigorous crusade for class conscious, socialist political action, as well as for industrial unionism. Defeated in a strike in the Waihi mines in 1912, and convinced that the ranks of labor must be consolidated at all costs, militants took the initiative in calling a conference which attempted to unify labor's political activity in a new Social Democratic party. Even its milder Fabian tones failed to win much support, and discouraged by the disastrous failure of the 1913 maritime strike and by the success of non-socialist labor candidates in the election the following year,[7] Socialist leaders were ready to join more moderate elements in forming a party willing to assert Labor's independence inside as well as outside parliament.

---

[5] Twenty-one of the 34 candidates supported by local labor groups or *ad hoc* committees were elected. All but five of these were Liberals who had been endorsed but not selected by labor.

[6] Among the more important stumbling blocks to winning the trades and labor councils to the idea of independence were the unwillingness of Labor parliamentarians to burn their political bridges behind them, the feeling of many unionists that independence would be suicide, and the adroitness of Richard Seddon, the Liberal leader, in nipping incipient insurgency in the bud by appointing its leaders to office. A Political Labor League, launched in 1904, went out of existence in 1909; a "New Zealand Labour Party," created by vote of the Trades and Labor Council conference of 1910, functioned only in the election of 1911, being superseded by the United Labor party in 1912. The last organization was an attempt to fuse the industrial and political activities of labor in a single organization, as well as to compromise the divergent points of view of "arbitrationists," "direct actionists," and "socialists."

At the same time, a series of political developments strengthened the hand of those in the trades councils who were predisposed toward an independent parliamentary Labor group. After the conservative Reform party came to power in 1912, the coercive action of the Massey government in the Waihi strike and the willingness of Sir Joseph Ward, the Liberal standard-bearer, to identify himself with a National war cabinet headed by Massey alienated many who had previously clung to the Liberal alliance. As the war progressed, dissatisfaction with the government's war policies and the rising cost of living tended to unify labor. Compulsory military service was strongly opposed, and when anti-conscription speeches were classified as seditious, and labor leaders were sent to jail, many moderate unionists joined pacifists and international socialists in protest.

Inside and outside parliament, formerly warring groups had been drawn close together before 1916; the conference which resolved in July that "the time has arrived for the formation of a New Zealand Labour Party for the purpose of consolidating the political forces of Labour" did little more than formalize and perpetuate machinery through which groups with divergent aims had been cooperating in local and by-elections since 1914.

In its initial constitution the new party boldly stated its objective as "the socialisation of the means of production, distribution and exchange." But the specific planks that followed reflected the moderate views of the bulk of the unionists and it was the spirit of reform rather than reconstruction which was to prevail in the years ahead. The socialist objective has long since been dropped from the constitution.[8] When the party took office in 1935 its slogans were "Security and Prosperity for All" and "Maximum Production and Equitable Distribution." Faced with the emergency of the depression and the war, it applied pragmatic solutions to concrete problems; capitalism was modified, but the party found no viable alternative to a mixed economy.

Attempts to win the New Zealand labor movement to Marxian socialism or even to clear-cut Fabian aims and tactics had been defeated before the present party was formed. Nevertheless, the movement has always included a small but active and persistent group of dedicated socialists. To many of them, "socialism" is little more than a vague ideal eliciting a favorable emotional response; few have a very clear idea of the differences between a capitalist and a socialist society or of how the transition is to be made. Without a firm philosophical basis or sense of direction even at the outset, after 1917 they were further divided and confused by the tensions generated by the Russian Bolshevik revolution. But in spite of its small numbers and lack of unity, the importance of this group should not be discounted. The first three leaders of the Labor party were drawn from it,[9] many of the most active branch members are identified with it, and when differences over industrial policy arise, the division between "militants" and "moderates" tends to merge with the hazier differences between "socialists" and "non-socialists" to form a vague "left" and "right." Under favorable conditions the "left" may become an important nucleus of disaffection and even of open revolt.

---

[7] Of the 18 candidates in that election, nine had been selected by the Social Democratic party, five had been sponsored by local "Labor Representation Committees," and the remaining four ran with the support of other local labor groups, sometimes with Liberal support. Of the six who were elected, only two had been endorsed by the Social Democratic party. The election, held in an atmosphere of patriotic enthusiasm shortly after the outbreak of the war, strengthened the position of the Reform party in parliament.

[8] The party's present aims are stated as follows: "The purpose of the Party is to educate the public in the principles of Co-operation and Socialism; to elect competent men and women to Parliament and Local Authorities; and to ensure the just distribution of the production and services of New Zealand. . . . The objective of the Party is to promote and protect the freedom of the people and their political, social, economic and cultural welfare." When the constitution was revised in 1951, a motion to reinstate the original socialist objective was defeated by a vote of 149 to 359.

From its organization to the great depression, Labor's strength in parliament grew slowly.[10] Until 1931 it was one of three parties. In that year the Reform party and the old Liberals (rechristened the United party) merged into what eventually became the National party. An essentially two-party alignment has continued to the present.[11] Labor's percentage of the total vote rose from 26.4 in 1928 to 34.9 in 1931. In 1935, with 47.3 per cent of the vote and 53 seats in the House of Representatives, the party assumed the reins of government. It reached the peak of its electoral support in 1938 and retained office in 1943 and 1946. At the general election of 1949, Labor was defeated; it was unable to win

---

[9] H. E. Holland, M. J. Savage, and Peter Fraser.

[10] The following table, compiled from the official election figures published after each general election, tells the story. Only the votes for *endorsed* Labor candidates are included. Maori as well as European electorates are given.

Year	Candidates Elected	Vote Polled	Per cent of Total Voted Polled
1919	8	132,715	24.4
1922	17	145,148	23.3
1925	12	184,616	27.5
1928	19	196,385	26.4
1931	24	291,991	34.9
1935	53	392,965	47.3
1938	53	528,296	55.8
1943	45	447,918	47.4
1946	42	537,632	51.4
1949	34	506,100	47.1
1951	30	499,143	45.8

[11] For a brief account of the development of New Zealand parties, see Leslie Lipson, *The Politics of Equality: New Zealand's Adventure in Democracy* (Chicago, 1948).

back its majority in 1951 or 1954, although it gained some seats in the latter election.[12]

Labor's early support came largely from working-class areas in industrial and mining centers. After 1928, however, it gained in lower middle class areas; in the landslide victory of 1935, it made its most spectacular gains in country-town and rural electorates.[13] The view that Labor as a party is still dependent upon groups outside the labor movement for a parliamentary majority has been stressed recently by the Honorable A. H. Nordmeyer. As he put it in his presidential address to the 1951 party conference:

> . . . It must never be forgotten that in a country like New Zealand, not as highly industrialized as many other lands, Labour cannot rely for its support on industrial labour alone. Political Labour can only attain power by attracting the support and votes of other sections as well. Anyone who thinks otherwise is blind to the facts of history and of recent experience in this country.[14]

II

Like its British and Australian counterparts, the New Zealand Labor party rests upon three cornerstones: the representative party hierarchy with the individual membership as its base, the parliamentary Labor group, and the affiliated trade unions from which it draws its most dependable support. Although the membership of the Federation of Labor and the party is not identical and relations between them are not always harmonious, most unions are identified with both the party and the federation.

The important organs of the party hierarchy are the local branch, the Labor-Representation Committee or "L.R.C.," the annual conference, and the national executive.[15] From 1914 on, labor groups in many centers had coordinated their efforts through informal Labor Representation Committees; in the constitution as drafted in 1916 these were continued as the basic units of the new party. The branches were added in 1917, and in spite of repeated efforts to merge branches and L.R.C.'s into a single unit, both have been continued.

---

[12] The surprise of the 1954 election was the heavy vote polled for the candidates of a revived Social Credit Political League. Although none of its candidates was elected, it polled more than 11 per cent of the total votes and resulted in the election of 25 candidates without an absolute majority, an unusual situation in New Zealand. The success of the Social Credit Political League suggests dissatisfaction with both of the other parties.

[13] R. M. Chapman, "The Significance of the 1928 Election, A Study in Certain Trends in New Zealand Politics during the Nineteen-Twenties," Auckland University College M.A. thesis. In this significant statistical study electorates are classified in five groups: city; town; country-town; balanced (town and country); and rural. In 1935 the Labor vote rose in all classes of electorates, but the increase was 69 per cent in country-town seats, 45 per cent in rural seats, 40 per cent in the towns, and only 27 per cent in the cities. Chapman advances the thesis that by 1925 Labor had absorbed the "manual worker" seats, and from then on further gains were at the expense of the Reform party.

[14] Mr. Nordmeyer was speaking at the time of the dispute on the waterfront.

[15] The organization is set forth in New Zealand Labor Party, *Constitution with L.R.C. and Branch Rules*, as amended at the 1951 conference. The citations which follow are to this edition of the constitution unless otherwise indicated. Much of what follows is drawn from personal observation at Wellington L.R.C. meetings over a period of six months, and attendance at single L.R.C. and branch meetings at Palmerston North ("fat lamb" country), Hamilton (dairying), Greymouth (West Coast mining), and Oamaru (South Island agricultural), as well as Auckland, Christchurch, and Dunedin.

A branch is a small unit of ten or more members over 18 years of age who subscribe to the constitution and policy of the party, are not members of organizations declared to be incompatible with membership of the party, and who pay the requisite dues.[16] Persons qualifying as branch members do so as individuals; identification with an affiliated union does not automatically entitle one to branch membership, and branches include persons who are identified with unaffiliated unions or with nonunionized professions such as teaching or law.[17] By 1952, over 600 branches were in existence, ranging in membership from ten to hundreds, with 60 to 80 the norm. Although branches are identified with geographical areas, residence in the specified locality is not a prerequisite for membership. Some branches, in fact, become somewhat feudal in character, forming about a forceful or ambitious personality who may have been the leader of a faction defeated elsewhere. No person may belong to more than one branch, a person refused admission to one branch is not eligible to membership in another branch without the approval of the L.R.C. having jurisdiction over the latter branch, and the registration of new branches is subject to the approval of the national executive. In addition to the "ordinary" branches already described, special women's, junior, and Maori branches may be organized. Membership in a special branch does not disqualify one for membership in an ordinary branch; dual memberships among women are not infrequent.

The L.R.C. functions in a geographical area, the boundaries of which usually coincide with those of the electorates from which members of the House of Representatives are chosen. In no case is an electorate divided between two or more L.R.C.'s.[18] Thus its jurisdiction is much wider than that of the branch; several branches or parts of branches come within its supervision. Including delegates from affiliated unions as well as branches, with representation roughly scaled to the membership of the group represented, delegates from trade unions usually outnumber those from the branches.[19] Subject to the control of the national executive, the L.R.C. exercises extensive power in the area of its jurisdiction. Meetings must be held at least monthly; some L.R.C.'s meet oftener. The president, vice-president, secretary-treasurer, and five other members elected annually by the L.R.C. constitute an executive committee. The powers of this body are not defined very precisely and vary widely in practice, but it is always an important focus of leadership and control.

---

[16] The Constitution (Sec. 14 A) fixes minimum branch dues at five shillings per member.

[17] For example, in 1952 the Clerical Workers' Union, an affiliate of the Federation of Labor, was not affiliated with the party, but some of its members were active in party branches.

[18] The jurisdiction of a few L.R.C.'s (*e.g.*, Wellington) covers several electorates.

[19] As of 1952, branches and affiliations were entitled to the following representation: 50 members, one delegate; 51 to 125 members, two delegates; 126 to 200 members, three delegates; 201 to 300 members, four delegates, with one additional delegate for every additional 100 members up to a maximum of seven.

In the Auckland L.R.C. there were approximately 50 delegates from trade unions and 40 from branches; 121 of the 176 representatives in the North Canterbury L.R.C. (Christchurch) were from affiliated unions; in the rural area of Oamaru, 26 of the 40 delegates represented unions.

The party's central organs are a national executive, a "head office" or permanent secretariat, and an annual conference. The president, vice-president, secretary-treasurer, and five of the other members of the executive are chosen annually by conference as a whole; the remaining members of the executive are elected in geographical areas. Since 1921 the constitution has stipulated that the five executive members chosen by conference as a whole must reside "at the place where the National Office is situated."[20] The headquarters has been at the capital city ever since, and there has been a good deal of criticism of "Wellington control." Resentment stems both from the disproportionate number of votes accorded Wellington on the executive and from the informal practice of considering the Wellington members a "central executive" with power to act between the infrequent meetings of the full executive. Repeated efforts to change the number of Wellington representatives have failed, but conference has insisted upon quarterly meetings of the full executive, thus limiting somewhat the role of the central group.

The leader and secretary of the parliamentary Labor party sit as non-voting members of the executive. Since members of parliament may be, and not infrequently are, elected to regular seats on this body, their influence may be much greater. The first four presidents of the party were chosen from among the parliamentarians.[21] In 1952 the president and two other members of the Wellington group were members of the House of Representatives. Objection to members of parliament serving on the national executive has been voiced from time to time, but efforts to bar them or limit their role have been unsuccessful.[22]

In its early years the party struggled along without a permanent headquarters or a paid staff. In the words of a pioneer member: "They gave Mr. J. Glover a lead pencil and a postage stamp and appointed him secretary."[23] From this modest beginning has grown a head office under the management of a full-time salaried secretary, a staff of five, comfortable headquarters in one of the best office buildings in Wellington, and an annual operating budget of £6000 to £7000.[24]

---

[20] *Constitution*, 1951, sec. 10 B.

[21] 1916, J. McCombs, M.P.; 1917, A. Walker, M.P.; 1918 and 1919, J. T. Paul, M.L.C.; 1920, Peter Fraser, M.P.

[22] At the 1920 conference opposition to the influence of parliamentarians was so vocal that when Peter Fraser, M.P., was elected president he refused to serve, and only reversed his decision after conference had unanimously refused to accept his resignation. (Report of the 4th Annual Conference, 1920, as given in the *Maoriland Worker*, August 11, 1920.)

[23] *New Zealand Worker*, May 7, 1924. The statement was made by R. Semple.

[24] Estimated from the "Comparative Statement of Receipts and Payments, 1946–47 to 1951–52," as given in *Report of the 36th Annual Conference*, 1952. Grants to electorates and expenses of annual conferences and meetings of the executive were not included in the above estimates.

Much of the credit for building up an adequate headquarters staff rests with Walter

In the words of the constitution, the annual conference is "the supreme governing body of the Party." Meeting usually in April, this "grand assembly" brings together delegates from branches, L.R.C.'s, and affiliated unions throughout the Dominion. Each L.R.C. is entitled to two delegates and two votes, but the representation and voting strength of other constituent bodies are scaled to their size.[25] The same person not infrequently represents both a branch or L.R.C. and a union; the rules limit the aggregate votes one individual may cast to three.[26] Upon demand, a card vote is used, each delegate holding up a card indicating the number of votes he is entitled to cast. Before he enters upon his duties, each delegate must sign a pledge stating that he is not a member of any organization, membership in which is incompatible with membership in the Labor party; that he accepts the constitution and policy of the party; and that he will uphold decisions made pursuant to the constitution and work for its selected candidates.[27] Members of the national executive, including the non-voting parliamentary representatives, are entitled to attend conference but vote only if they are also accredited delegates.

The emphasis in Labor party conferences is upon business, but they are not without life and color. The entrance of the parliamentary leader, especially when Labor is in office, is likely to be greeted by what is recorded in the proceedings as "thunderous applause"; delegates sometimes honor distinguished visitors from abroad by rising and singing "He's a Jolly Good Fellow"; and at the end all join hands and sing "Auld Lang Syne."[28] Conferences are considered private affairs; representatives of the Labor press are the only ones admitted, and visitors must be vouched for by the executive or a delegate. The "capitalist" press must depend upon reports given to it by a press secretary and upon such gossip as may be pried from delegates. Earlier conferences were small, intimate gatherings of 40 to 50, but since 1937 attendance has never dropped below 350 and often exceeds 500.

Prominent in the proceedings of conference are the address of the president and the reports of the national executive and the parliamentary leader. Dissatisfaction with the leadership may be voiced in amendments moved to these

---

Nash, the present parliamentary leader, who held the post of secretary from 1922 to 1931. During the latter part of that time he was also a member of parliament. The three secretaries who followed him, and who served collectively for 15 years, all "graduated" into parliament. There was sufficient criticism of this practice so that when the present secretary was chosen his lack of political ambitions was cited by some as an asset.

[25] As of 1952, representation was as follows: branches or affiliations with membership not exceeding 200, one delegate and one vote; branches or affiliations with membership of 201 to 500, two delegates and two votes; branches or affiliations with membership of 501 to 1000, three delegates and three votes; branches or affiliations with membership of 1000 to 1500, four delegates and four votes; one extra delegate or vote for each additional 500 members over 1500.

[26] However, if one of the organizations a delegate represents is entitled to more than three votes, this rule is interpreted to mean that he may cast that number but no more.

[27] Labor Representation Committees—Rules, Sec. 4 B. The rules governing eligibility of conference delegates are identical with those applying to L.R.C. delegates.

[28] Earlier conferences concluded with the singing of the "Red Flag," but those radical days are no more.

reports, but the amendments are seldom passed. Constituent bodies are entitled to submit "remits" to be considered at conference and these come in by the hundreds.[29] The increase in the size of conference and the number of remits necessitate a more tightly controlled agenda, greater use of committees, and more stringent limitations on discussion. Since 1939 it has been the practice for the national executive to set up a subcommittee to screen and consolidate the remits. The result is a more manageable remit paper of about 100 items grouped under some twenty-odd headings, but considerable dissatisfaction is felt by those who feel that their remits are ignored or emasculated and who are not given an opportunity to defend their point of view before the subcommittee. Once conference convenes, some eight or ten committees are set up, to which remits dealing with similar matters are referred. The recommendations of these committees are usually, although not always, accepted. As revised in 1951, the constitution provided for a three-year cycle; the conference following each triennial general election is to deal primarily with constitutional changes, the next with matters of general concern, and that immediately preceding the general election with policy questions.[30]

In terms of membership and finance, the party has been greatly strengthened by compulsory unionism. As Table I indicates, membership grew slowly during the early years and did not reach the 50,000 mark until 1929–30. After compulsory unionism went into effect in 1936, it soared to over 200,000. The party lost ground during the war years, partly because many members were absent in the armed services and partly because of dissension within its ranks; the 200,000 mark was not reached again until 1947–48. Compulsory unionism also helped to solve the party's financial problems. Its most dependable source of income is the approximately £10,000 flowing into the treasury annually from the affiliated unions. In addition, the unions contribute generously to campaign funds collected by the head office and raise substantial sums in the electorates during campaign years.[31] Looking at this record it is easy to understand why,

---

[29] Prior to the 1938 conference 700 remits were received. In 1939 the number was over 1000. Remits must be forwarded to the head office at least three months before the date of conference. Two months before conference the head office sends copies of the remit paper to L.R.C.'s, branches, and affiliations.

[30] Premised on general elections at regular three-year intervals, this plan was immediately thrown out of gear by the unexpected dissolution of 1951. The 1951 conference, held before parliament was dissolved, dealt largely with constitutional questions, and the 1952 conference dealt mainly with policy issues.

[31] An important source of income is special levies upon union members. It is often stated that waterside workers are expected to contribute £1 per member in an election year.

In reporting on the 1938 parliamentary election (*Report of the 23d Conference*, 1939), the national executive singled out the following unions for "special thanks" for their generous contributions:

Waterside Workers' Union	£4,574
N.Z. Workers' Union	2,809
N.Z. Hotel and Restaurant Workers' Union	2,500
N.Z. Seamen's Union	1,500
Post & Telegraph Association	1,000
Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants	1,000

TABLE I. MEMBERSHIP AND RECEIPTS OF THE NEW ZEALAND LABOR PARTY, 1917–18 TO 1951–52*

Year	Membership	Current Receipts £	Year	Membership	Current Receipts £
1917–18	18,000[a]	—[c]	1935–36	33,114	6,433[e]
1918–19	21,500[a]	—[c]	1936–37	67,723	5,392
1919–20	25,000[a]	909[e]	1937–38	162,157	23,619
1920–21	—[b]	412	1938–39	203,501	51,469[e]
1921–22	25,000[a]	649	1939–40	236,605	53,887
1922–23	—[c]	1,176	1940–41	225,886	42,701
1923–24	—[c]	1,400[e]	1941–42	—[c]	15,419[f]
1924–25	—[d]	1,469	1942–43	—[c]	9,151[f]
1925–26	45,677	11,675[e]	1943–44	144,890	24,397[e]
1926–27	45,180	3,087	1944–45	157,263	9,819
1927–28	—[c]	2,394	1945–46	—[c]	12,979
1928–29	47,384	10,132[e]	1946–47	162,055	37,222[e]
1929–30	50,651	2,544	1947–48	201,765	28,354
1930–31	48,219	3,250	1948–49	—[c]	18,183
1931–32	45,610	5,406	1949–50	—[c]	40,505[e]
1932–33	39,358	2,444	1950–51	—[c]	23,090
1933–34	33,550	2,511	1951–52	—[c]	36,243[e]
1934–35	31,217	3,232			

[a] Figures approximate only.

[b] "Slightly better than last year."

[c] Data not available.

[d] "Has grown by thousands."

[e] Election years.

[f] According to the Report of the National Executive, the decrease is because so many members were serving in the armed forces.

* Compiled from the reports of the annual conferences, 1917 to 1952. Through the courtesy of the secretary and president, office copies, including some supplementary material, were placed at the disposal of the writer. Statistics are usually for the year ending March 1.

officially, the party rises to the defense of compulsory unionism.[32] A measure passed by the National government in 1950 makes it illegal for a trade union to contribute to a party unless this action has been approved by an absolute majority of the entire membership. Although few unions have taken such a poll, and no union has been penalized for violating the provisions of the law, the party does not seem to have been seriously handicapped by it.[33]

---

[32] The rival National party, which attacked compulsory unionism in the 1949 campaign, did not repeal this provision of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act after it came to office. It did, however, make compulsory unionism contingent on a secret ballot if petition of 15 per cent of the union's financial members demanded it. The opinion was widespread in Labor circles that this change of heart on the part of their political opponents was prompted by the conviction that compulsory unionism indirectly aided the National government because of its conservative effect upon the Federation of Labor.

[33] Preceding the 1951 election, the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants was the only important union which had taken such a poll. The law could be circumvented by

III

At the outset, the L.R.C.'s were given almost complete control of the selection of candidates, the only limitation being that persons chosen must have been *bona fide* members of the party for at least six months. Gradually, however, uniform procedures were imposed and control by the executive was tightened. The constitutional revision of 1926 included rules that remained in effect with little alteration until 1951.

Under the 1926 provisions, parliamentary candidates were selected by ballot of party members in the respective L.R.C.'s, although the choice had to be made from a list approved by the national executive.[34] Throughout the years of its use, rank and file selection was under attack. The difficulty of compiling accurate lists of the names and addresses of affiliated trade union members raised serious problems. Not more than one-fourth of the party members are on the branch rolls. In the case of those who acquire membership through identification with an affiliated trade union, it is the responsibility of the union secretary to certify to the party officers the number of members and to allocate them among the various electorates. Union secretaries know what their paid-up membership is, but they rarely have an accurate record of the residences of their members, especially in the case of mobile workers like the watersiders and railwaymen.[35] Other difficulties stemmed from the fact that members of affiliated unions were eligible to participate in selection ballots irrespective of their personal political predilections. "Right-wing" members feared interference by Communists, and the "left" was equally alarmed at the prospect that the choice of candidates might be influenced by unionists not in sympathy with Labor's cause. The latter point was pressed with particular vigor after the introduction of compulsory unionism. When the question of selection was under consideration in the 1951 conference, failure to find solutions to these problems played into the hands of those who favored the abandonment of rank and file selection for other reasons.[36] In the meantime, selection by the executive had been used as a temporary expedient in several instances. Before the 1935 election, which brought Labor to power, the executive had taken the

---

the unions' making loans with the understanding that they would not be repaid, and by collecting levies from union members on the job.

[34] *Constitution*, 1926, Secs. 16, 17, 18. The date for selecting candidates was fixed by the national executive but the casting and counting of the ballots was conducted by the L.R.C.'s in cooperation with affiliated unions. Although the constitution did not require it, a postal ballot was often used. Candidates for selection were not permitted to canvass in their own behalf or to instruct others to canvass for them.

[35] In Dunedin, a city with 16,000 to 18,000 affiliated members, the addresses of only 6,000 to 7,000 would be available. In a postal vote only about 1,000 of these would be returned. In one electorate in which there were about 2,000 members only 378 ballots were returned in a postal ballot and the selected candidate received only about 200 votes. There were instances in which waterside workers were polled on the wharves, although this was not strictly constitutional.

[36] The vote was 304 to 240. There had been earlier unsuccessful attempts to limit voting to branch members, or to void selection ballots in which less than a certain percentage of the members had participated.

initiative in adding to the approved list the names of a number of able younger men, many of whom were outside the trade union field;[37] conference of that year voted the executive "full power" to determine selections not yet made. Again in 1946, when changes in the electoral boundaries shortened the time available for selecting candidates, choice was left to the executive in cooperation with committees of the respective L.R.C.'s.[38]

The rules adopted in 1951 permit any six members of the party resident within the electorate to nominate a candidate, but the final choice rests with a selection committee of six, three of whom are members of the national executive. The remaining three are appointed by the L.R.C. involved.[39] The selection committee is not limited to persons nominated; in 1951 there were two instances in which the choice was made from outside this list.[40] As the pledge was revised in 1951, a candidate must swear he is not a member of any other political party or organization declared to be incompatible with membership in the party, and promise wholeheartedly to support the selected candidates of the party, faithfully to observe its constitution and policy, and, if elected, to vote on all questions in accordance with the decisions of a majority of caucus.[41]

Opinion varies as to whether the new machinery is better than the old. Some feel that while rank and file selection had its shortcomings, the present machinery is worse; others that the use of selection committees was the lesser of two evils. Few maintain that the new method has effected any radical change in the type of candidate. Under either system it was unusual for a sitting member to be denied re-selection, even when there was tacit agreement that he had ceased to be an effective representative.

IV

The New Zealand Labor party has seldom been without an undercurrent of disaffection, but splits and "breakaways" have been few. The one open challenge to the leadership ended in the explusion of J. A. Lee in 1940, and the organization of a short-lived Democratic Labor party.

Lee, a native New Zealander who had lost an arm in the First World War and received a Distinguished Conduct Medal, was endowed with considerable oratorical talent and a flair for publicity.[42] When the party came to power, he represented the Labor stronghold of Grey Lynn, a suburb of Auckland, and was generally recognized as one of the party's more popular, if somewhat headstrong, younger members. When Savage became prime minister, he insisted that he, and not caucus, should select the cabinet members. Lee and most of the other younger left-wing members were passed over, but Lee was given a junior post in the Ministry of Finance, headed by Walter Nash. Lee was put in charge of housing, but his unorthodox views on finance soon involved him in disagreements with Nash. The first disciplinary action against Lee arose from the so-called "Lee letter," which was an attack upon Nash's financial policy.[43] Following prolonged debate in 1939, conference censured him by a vote of 285 to 207 and instructed the executive, in consultation with the parliamentary members, to take "appropriate action."[44] The action of the executive was exceedingly mild; Lee was asked to do his best to prevent further circulation of the letter in question.

---

[37] *Report of the 19th Annual Conference*, 1935. In its report to the conference that year the executive refers to the "time and thought" given to the character and suitability of candidates, and the frequent joint meetings with parliamentary members in an endeavor to arrive at decisions which would serve that end. The list of candidates selected included 14 who had never previously contested a parliamentary seat. Only three of them had trade union backgrounds.

[38] This procedure had been approved in advance by the 1945 conference. A motion to rescind the action was ruled out of order at the 1946 conference.

[39] *Report of the 35th Annual Conference*, 1951.

[40] In one instance the same person was nominated by several electorates. After placing the one whom they considered the strongest candidate in the strongest Labor electorate the selection committee found itself faced with "impossible" candidates before all the other selections had been made.

[41] The significant alterations in the pledge were the omission of any promise to support the party's platform, and the clause barring those identified with organizations declared incompatible with membership in the party.

Lee's expulsion from the party was precipitated by an article which he wrote for a left-wing journal, *Tomorrow.* The article was entitled "Psycho-Pathology in Politics"; although the Rt. Hon. M. J. Savage was not mentioned by name, it was generally interpreted as an attack upon him.[45] The national executive expressed strong disapproval of the article, and demanded that Lee apologize and give assurance that subsequent articles written by him would be submitted to the executive before publication. The charge that Lee failed to keep this bargain led to his expulsion by the 1940 conference, the card vote being

---

[42] Lee grew up in Auckland in a period when it was a crossroads for radicals. He says his thinking was influenced by Jack London and Upton Sinclair, and describes himself as a "Voltairian Socialist" opposed to "Popes—political as well as religious." The day he came back from the war he joined the Labor party and was an unsuccessful candidate in 1919. He was elected in 1922 and 1925, but lost in 1928. In 1931, 1935, and 1938 he was elected in Grey Lynn by large majorities. Charges of irregularities in selection ballots on Lee's behalf were reported to the national executive in 1931. Although the executive reported that the irregularities were of a minor character, conference directed that a new ballot be held under supervision of the national executive. Lee won by a vote of 208 to 108. In 1932 the executive singled out Lee as one of the new members to be congratulated on the "splendid manner" in which they had launched their parliamentary careers. The conference that year congratulated Lee and Peter Fraser for taking a stand in the House of Representatives which led to their suspension. Fraser's part in this is described in James Thorn, *Peter Fraser* (London, 1952), p. 99.

[43] According to Lee, he originally intended to limit circulation of the letter to members of the Labor party. After an uncorrected copy which Lee had shown to a parliamentary friend was circulated among non-Labor members, Lee decided to circulate the corrected version. Needless to say, the letter was widely circulated among Labor's "enemies."

[44] *Report of the 23d Annual Conference,* 1939. Lee's side of the story, written after his expulsion, appeared as a pamphlet entitled *I Fight for New Zealand.*

[45] The article appeared in the issue of December 6, 1939. Its theme was that the fate of nations is affected by the physical and mental illness of leaders, who may tend to become "pathological autocrats." Although it was not generally known at the time, Savage was a desperately sick man. He died of cancer while the 1940 conference was in progress. In a "confidential report," written by him and read at that conference, Savage bitterly attacked Lee, who, he claimed, had made "desperate attempts" to destroy him as a political force.

546 to 344.[46] Although the official position of the party was that Lee was expelled for "disloyalty to the Party and treachery to the leader," rather than for differences over policy and caucus procedures, it is clear that Lee and Savage had differed over these matters and that the tendency of Savage and his cabinet colleagues to overrule caucus decisions lent some color to Lee's claim that he was expelled "for attacking Autocracy and Money Power."[47] Although conference expelled Lee by an impressive vote, there was some question as to whether the procedures followed conformed strictly to the principles of the constitution.[48] A leadership with more confidence in the movement and more sensitive to the importance of democratic procedures might have achieved the same result without leaving itself open to these criticisms. Beneath the personal animosity between Lee and Savage and Lee's obvious indiscretions, is a more fundamental question to be discussed later: when Labor is in power, what are the respective roles of cabinet, the parliamentary group as a whole, the executive, and conference?

After his expulsion, Lee organized a rival Democratic Labor party, which was promptly proscribed by the Labor party executive.[49] Of the 51 candidates who entered the 1943 contest under Lee's banner, all but one lost his deposit,[50] and in his old electorate of Grey Lynn, Lee himself was defeated by a Labor candidate. Labor retained a safe majority in the House, but it lost five seats and blamed Lee for this.[51] Lee's party did not participate in the 1946 election. After attempting unsuccessfully to regain his seat in Grey Lynn in 1949, Lee dropped into political obscurity.[52]

---

[46] *Report of the 24th Annual Conference*, 1940. The exact wording of the motion was as follows: "That John A. Lee, M.P. for Grey Lynn, having been guilty of conduct and acts inconsistent with his position as a member of his Party, this conference in the interests of the Labour Movement, hereby expels him from the New Zealand Labour Party."

[47] The official version of Lee's expulsion is recapitulated in *Report of the 30th Annual Conference*, 1946. Lee's side is stated in a pamphlet issued by the Grey Lynn Democratic Labour party and entitled, *Expelled from the Labour Party for Telling the Truth.*

[48] The question of Lee's expulsion was not on the order paper of the conference and hence branches and affiliations had no opportunity to discuss it or instruct their delegates how to vote. Lee's own L.R.C. in Auckland had expressed confidence in both Lee and Savage, after the Lee article had been read, and a motion of censure proposed. Lee's supporters maintained that while his opponents at conference were given unlimited time, his supporters were kept strictly within the three-minute rule. The Hon. W. E. Barnard, Speaker of the House of Representatives, who was the only member of parliament to resign from the party in protest over the action taken against Lee, stressed undemocratic procedures in caucus and conference in a pamphlet entitled *The Speech of a New Zealander.* There is the same emphasis in "Mr. Lee Expelled," *Tomorrow*, April 3, 1941.

[49] *Report of the 25th Annual Conference*, 1941. This action was unanimously endorsed by the conference of that year.

[50] In addition, W. E. Barnard, who ran as an Independent, was defeated by an official Labor candidate.

[51] Lee's party polled four per cent of the total vote. The percentage of the total vote polled by Labor dropped from 55.8 in 1938 to 47.4 in 1943, but it was slightly higher than in 1935.

[52] Efforts to bring about a reconciliation between Lee and the Labor party, initiated at various times by branches and industrial groups, failed. In 1952, Lee was publishing a sheet called *John A. Lee's Fortnightly*, which included two pages of comment by him.

A disciplinary problem that antedated the Lee issue and has continued to the present concerns Labor's relation with the Communist party and "Communist auxiliaries." Formal requests of the New Zealand Communist party to affiliate with the Labor party, made repeatedly from 1924 on, were consistently refused, but an earlier attitude which might be described as one of "peaceful coexistence" gave place to sharp hostility. More difficult has been the status of avowed or suspected Communists whom affiliated unions see fit to send as their delegates to L.R.C.'s or to party conferences. The party has consistently refused to waive or modify its pledge so that avowed Communists, credentialed by their respective unions, may take it in good faith.[53] At the same time it is possible for a "concealed" Communist to represent an affiliation if he is willing to take the pledge. Members of organizations suspected of following the Communist line have likewise been barred from membership in the party. At various times the proscribed list has included the following: "Friends of the Soviet Union," "Movement against War and Fascism," "Peace and Anti-Conscription League," "Workers' Democratic Defense Association," "Women's Charter Movement," "Society for Closer Relations with Russia." Persons identified with these organizations not only are denied party membership but may not even address branch or L.R.C. meetings. Nor may Labor groups cooperate in meetings held under their auspices, give them financial assistance, or distribute their literature.[54] In trying to protect itself from the Communist virus, the party has gone to such lengths as to direct branches not to reply to communications from Communist auxiliaries, and has given the executive power to expel a member of the party "who publicly expresses or publishes statements at variance with the party's policy in any way calculated to cause dissension and disunity within the ranks of the party."[55]

Subject only to appeal to conference, control of disciplinary matters rests with the national executive. A branch may deny membership for any reason—or for no reason—and members may be suspended by branches or L.R.C.'s. But expulsion must be by action of the executive, with a right of appeal to conference. Expulsion has been used sparingly, but left-wing members complain that a broad interpretation of "Communist auxiliary" serves much the same purpose, and that there is a growing tendency to brand all criticism of the party's leadership as Communist-inspired.

---

[53] An interesting debate on this point took place in 1927. When a seat was denied a delegate from the Westland Timber Workers, the Deniston Miners' Union argued that if non-Communists sent Communists to represent them they "must trust them," and that "the thing which mattered was the Unity of the working class." Ten years later the party again defeated a remit which would have exempted from the pledge delegates from unions, but at the same time voted down as "impracticable" a resolution which would have required all members of affiliated organizations to take the pledge.

[54] In 1952 the executive warned members not to associate with the coming "Peace Carnival" in Sydney, which it described as a "smoke screen" for Communist activities. (*Report of the 36th Annual Conference*, 1952.)

[55] The latter action, endorsed by the 1948 conference, was taken during a disagreement between the waterside workers and the Labor government.

V

The internal power structure of the New Zealand Labor party is if anything more complex than that of most political organizations. Untangling the lines of authority and control in the framework already described presents major difficulties. Is conference, representing the rank and file, the "artisan of the labor movement" in any real sense, or are major decisions made by the executive, the parliamentarians, the unions, or a shifting nucleus made up of members from one or more of these groups, depending upon circumstances?

As the "supreme governing body of the party," conference might be expected to play a decisive role in initiating and controlling policy. Yet over the years it is evident that there has been a shift in initiative from conference to the executive, and a strong tendency toward direction from the chair. Under existing rules the executive prepares the remit paper, exercises considerable discretion in grouping and summarizing the remits submitted and may introduce resolutions of its own; the nomination of members of the committees which discuss and report on remits rests with it (although names may be added from the floor of conference); the "convenors" or chairmen of these committees are selected by it. In recent years parliamentarians and members of the head office staff have been favored in the selection of chairmen.[56] In part these trends are the inevitable result of the increase in the size of conference and the multiplication of the remits submitted. In part, too, they stem from the party's shift from opposition to government, from the war emergency, and from the fear that intra-party disputes may be misrepresented and exaggerated by a press largely hostile to Labor. But to some extent they reflect fear of open rebellion and lack of confidence in the good judgment of the rank and file on the part of the leaders, which is a more serious matter. Criticism of the dictatorial tendencies of the presiding officer of conference rose to a crescendo during the long "reign" of "Big Jim" Roberts, who ruled conference with firmness and an omnipresent gavel for thirteen consecutive years from 1937 to 1950.[57]

The present leadership is aware of these criticisms of conference proceedings and has made an effort to create a different atmosphere. At the 1952 conference the Honorable A. J. Nordmeyer, Roberts' successor, presided with fairness: minorities were given an opportunity to express their views and in two instances recommendations of the executive were amended from the floor.[58] Nevertheless, even this conference was tightly controlled from the top in two ways:

---

[56] In the 1949, 1950, and 1952 conferences every convenor of a committee was a member of parliament or associated with the head office.

[57] James Roberts, who had been head of the Waterside Workers' Union, was sometimes referred to as the "uncrowned King of New Zealand." Although it was not unusual for presidents to be re-elected, none of his predecessors had served for more than four years. During Roberts' regime, there were repeated attempts to introduce election of the president by direct vote of the party membership, or limit his term of office. All were unsuccessful.

[58] Both were concerned with "Peace and War." One committed the party to strive for the development of the peaceful use of atomic energy; the other to take the initiative in launching a "Commonwealth Peace Movement." A resolution calling for the withdrawal of New Zealand's forces from Korea was defeated by a vote of 336 to 127.

most of the time was devoted to a discussion of policy reports drafted by the executive; and the convenors of all committees were selected from the personnel of the parliamentary party or the headquarters staff. The topics and emphasis of the executive reports had been decided after the president and secretary had sounded out rank and file opinion in a tour of L.R.C.'s, and probably focussed on issues which were uppermost in the minds of members,[59] but the initiative came from the top rather than the base of the party pyramid, and there had been no opportunity to discuss the resolutions in the branches before conference met.

The increased initiative of the executive is sometimes defended on the ground that if it waited for a lead from the rank and file, it would wait forever. This reflects a concern over the vitality of the branches and the L.R.C.'s that is shared by those who are most critical of the growing initiative of the executive. Between election campaigns, many branches are practically dormant, or become submerged in routine matters. Relatively few arouse themselves to send in remits for conference consideration.[60] Although the conference remit paper is sent to branches in advance of conference, in some cases it is never discussed, and in others the consideration is purely perfunctory.[61] Dissatisfaction with conference proceedings, the feeling that it has become little more than a democratic facade behind which others pull the strings, is one of the reasons why many constituent groups do not feel it worthwhile to incur the expense of attendance at these gatherings. L.R.C.'s are always represented, but it is not unusual for less than half the branches and affiliations to send delegates.[62] One is forced to the conclusion that although branch members do most of the "leg work" during campaigns, little of the initiative in policy comes from the branches, and few of them are effective forums for the dicussion of controversial issues. There are shining exceptions—branches where a few lively spirits, usually on the "left," valiantly try to keep alive an interest in ideas, and sometimes succeed for a time at least—but they are rare.

---

[59] They dealt with the following topics: "Principles of Labour" (the party's position on socialism), "Labour versus Communism," "Industrial Relations," and "Peace and War."

[60] In 1952, remits were submitted from 59 branches, 15 L.R.C.'s, and less than a dozen unions. Remits usually come from the same few constituent groups.

[61] One branch delegate, who was attending her first conference in 1952, reported that in her branch there was no discussion of the remit paper and that she felt poorly prepared for her responsibilities in conference. In another branch "consideration" of remits was limited to the chairman's statement, "We oppose (or favor) that one, don't we?"

The procedure followed in adopting the revised constitution of 1951 is a good illustration of how little control members may have over matters of vital concern. By vote of the 1950 conference, a committee on constitutional revision was directed to prepare a draft for discussion the following year. The committee was composed of the members of the national executive and five members from outside that body, selected by the executive from a panel of 47 nominated at the 1951 conference. The initial draft of the constitution was prepared by a subcommittee of this committee on constitutional revision, and was adopted by the full committee at meetings on March 29 and 30, 1951. At the 1951 conference discussion of the constitution was overshadowed by issues related to the waterfront dispute of that year. There were numerous attempts from the floor to amend the draft submitted, but very few were successful.

[62] In 1951, 119 of the 218 unions were not represented; 372 of the 634 branches sent no delegates. In the case of branches, financial considerations are very important. It is a problem of loss of wages and the difficulty of securing leave of absence from one's post, as well as one's expenses while attending the meetings. It is difficult for school teachers, for example, to be absent from their jobs. Not infrequently a person is chosen because he has relatives or friends in Wellington with whom he can stay. The larger unions pay the expenses of their delegates, and union secretaries incur no loss of income if they are sent

The L.R.C.'s, bringing together as they do representatives of the unions and the branches, would seem to offer an excellent forum for spontaneous exchange of ideas and for resolving divergent points of view. Actually, their effectiveness is limited by a preoccupation with routine business and local matters, leaving little time for discussion of national policy. Frank interchange of ideas is discouraged by the rules, and sometimes by the attitude of presiding officers as well.[63] All matters coming before the L.R.C. must be submitted in writing by a branch or affiliated organization, and are first discussed in the executive committee and usually come to the full L.R.C. meeting with an executive recommendation. Some executives view disagreement with hostility. There is a good deal of "steering from the chair," and dissenters and youthful upstarts are dealt with firmly, all of which tends to discourage open discussion. Union representatives attend in force when officers are to be elected, but at other times are much less faithful in attendance than the branch delegates. In some L.R.C.'s, this results in a continual tug-of-war between the officers, who represent the union viewpoint, and branch delegates, who tend to be more "left" in their views. Dissenters are silenced, but issues are not resolved; members who are repeatedly silenced but not convinced often turn to intrigue, with the result that far too many L.R.C.'s and branches become embroiled in what one secretary described as "personal vendettas."

The role of the rank and file in determining broad lines of policy may be debatable, but clearly the leaders have the final determination of the "Election Manifesto," which is the definitive statement of policy upon which the party goes to the electors in a campaign. In the early years, much of the time of conference was spent hammering out the platform, which every member and candidate was pledged to support on pain of apostasy. Today the Election Manifesto, prepared by a committee composed of members of the executive and parliamentary group, becomes the official policy of the party until the next campaign.[64] Remits passed by the last three conferences are referred to the committee, but in its final form the manifesto is neither debated nor approved by conference. Thus when parliamentary candidates pledge themselves faith-

---

as delegates. For this reason branches are often represented by union delegates. Area representatives on the national executive have their expenses paid by the head office and sometimes represent their respective branches.

[63] Reading the correspondence, which is part of the regular order of business, takes an amount of time out of all proportion to its importance; also the reports of the Labor members on the city council, hospital board, and other local bodies are often time-consuming. One gains the impression that there are times when officers welcome routine business as a way of avoiding controversial matters.

[64] *Constitution*, 1951, Sec. 12 D.

fully to observe the " policy" of the party, they are committing themselves to a program whose specific planks may be filled in after they are selected and not to a continuing statement of long-range objectives, forged in conference discussion, which stands until altered by that body.[65] The recession into the background of the party's long-range objectives, and the practice of keeping the election manifesto a carefully guarded secret until the party's leader opens the campaign, is sometimes explained as arising from a fear that if Labor's planks are known in advance they will be "stolen" by their political opponents. If true, this is pretty clear evidence that the differences between the parties have ceased to be fundamental.

The trend toward control of policy, selection, and discipline by a few is clear. But identifying this group precisely is not easy. What seems to emerge is an interlocking directorate of parliamentary and executive members, centered in Wellington, the balance within the group shifting, depending upon whether the party is in or out of power, and whether or not it has the united support of the industrial movement.

In theory, conference determines policy and the parliamentary Labor party decides how it is to be implemented. But when conference is not in session, the executive becomes the "governing body" of the party. In New Zealand there has never been the sharp cleavage between the executive and conference on the one hand and the parliamentarians on the other, nor the deep suspicion of parliamentarians by the rank and file, which have been so marked in Australia. Members of parliament are always heavily represented on the New Zealand executive and relations between the two are usually more harmonious than the relations between the executive and conference. With this close cooperation between the executive and the leaders in parliament, conference may be faced with a *fait accompli*. This is especially true when Labor controls the government and has the power to act. Repeatedly, during Labor's term of office, conference was warned that its resolutions could not bind the government, and that a Labor cabinet must exercise its discretion in determining *when* as well as *how* its program should be implemented. Thus, even in theory, the primary responsibility of a Labor cabinet would seem to be to the electorate as a whole rather than to conference or the movement which it represents.

Labor members of parliament have from the outset acted as an independent, disciplined group.[66] Within that group the balance of power shifts sharply in the direction of the prime minister and an inner group of cabinet colleagues when Labor is in power. The basic disagreement in the Lee controversy was between Savage, supported by this group, and the caucus majority. In the issue over the selection of the cabinet, Savage's contention that he be given a free hand in the selection of the cabinet was supported by the executive and eventually by conference.[67] After Savage's death, cabinet members were chosen by caucus, formally at least, and under both Fraser and Nash the parliamentary group has successfully asserted its right at least to be consulted on major policy decisions. Thus the controversy did not clearly delineate the roles of caucus as a whole and of the cabinet group. What did emerge clearly was the strength of an inner core of cabinet and executive members. Savage's personal popularity and dramatic death while conference was hearing the charges against Lee led many to think of him as a martyr, and to equate loyalty to the party with loyalty to the leader. There has been considerable stress upon "following the leader" in campaign appeals ever since.[68]

---

[65] It should be noted that the pledge, as revised in 1951, omitted reference to "Platform" or "Objective." The member now commits himself merely to observe the "Constitution and Policy of the Party."

[66] This was in strict accordance with a resolution moved by Holland and adopted at the party's first annual conference. (*Maoriland Worker*, July 18, 1917.)

Even when Labor is in office, leaders must think in terms of electoral majorities and an aroused conference may force the hand of the leadership group. The complete nationalization of the Bank of New Zealand in 1945 was the successful culmination of a movement which had been vigorously pressed for years by groups in conference.[69] Again in 1949, near the end of Labor's long term in office, conference forced Peter Fraser, its leader, to delay legislation providing for compulsory military training in peacetime until that step had been approved in a referendum election.[70]

---

[67] The constitution provides that in case of a disagreement between the parliamentary Labor party and the executive, the question be submitted to a joint conference of the members of the two bodies. In the dispute over the selection of the cabinet this procedure was followed and a compromise reached. Upon this point both sides seem to agree. However, Lee and Barnard maintained that this was a matter which lay within the exclusive control of the parliamentary Labor party, and that the executive had no right to interfere. Each side charged the other with failure to carry out the terms of the compromise formula. See *Report of the 23d Annual Conference*, 1939; J. A. Lee, *I Fight for New Zealand*; and W. E. Barnard, *The Speech of a New Zealander*.

[68] One of the posters used in the 1951 campaign showed likenesses of Holland, Savage, Fraser, and Nash, with the caption "Another Great Leader."

[69] Motions to this effect had been beaten or sidetracked repeatedly by Nash, Minister of Finance, who held the strategic post of convenor of the conference committee to which they were referred. He opposed the action on the ground that existing controls were so effective that the legislation was unnecessary. In 1944 a committee under different leadership (that of H. E. Combs, also an M. P.) recommended a resolution on monetary policy which included unequivocal support of nationalization of the Bank of New Zealand. The report was adopted by conference without Nash's support.

[70] *Report of the 33d Annual Conference*, 1949; and James Thorn, *Peter Fraser*, p. 269. The issue was a highly explosive one because of Labor's traditional opposition to conscription in time of war and the tendency to identify military training with compulsory military service. Peter Fraser had himself been among those jailed for opposition to conscription in World War I. At a special conference held June 3, 1940, the party had given the Labor government a free hand to conscript "men and money" during the war, but what was widely referred to as "peacetime conscription" was another matter. Fraser's initial request to the 1949 conference was for a vote authorizing the government "to use all the resources of the country, including compulsory military service." Opposition to this was so vocal and so bitter that Fraser later substituted a resolution requesting the government "to use all the resources of the country essential for the defense and preservation of our people, our country and our Commonwealth, and that if the resources are not available without compulsory National Service, the Government be requested to obtain the views of the electors on the question at a referendum." A referendum was held and the vote was overwhelmingly in favor of compulsory national service.

An important and even decisive voice in party affairs may be that of industrial leaders, and the position of the leadership group within the party may be seriously weakened by clashes between militants and moderates in the industrial movement. When the present New Zealand Federation of Labor (hereafter referred to as the F.O.L.) was organized in 1937, it was the hope of the political leaders that this would facilitate cooperation between the party and the unions as well as bring about industrial unity. New Zealand unions, unlike those in Britain, have no representation as such on the party's executive. But some union executives always have seats on the executive, and during Labor's term in office cooperation between the party and the F.O.L. was close. The executives of the two bodies met in frequent joint meetings and on a few occasions officers of the F.O.L. actually attended caucus meetings.[71] During these years the feeling was widespread that the controlling voice in industrial matters was that of F. P. Walsh of the Seamen's Union, long an influential figure in both the F.O.L. and the party, although not a member of parliament. Peter Fraser, Labor's wartime prime minister, was himself an old trade unionist, and it was alleged that Walsh's influence reached its peak during his lifetime.

Any semblance of harmony between the political and industrial wings of the movement was rudely shattered by the dispute which began on the waterfront in February, 1951. By this time the war was over, the National party was in office, Walter Nash had succeeded Fraser as leader of the Labor party, and dissatisfaction with the rigidity of the wage structure was mounting. The previous year friction between the Waterside Workers and the F.O.L. had culminated in an attempt to organize a rival Trade Union Congress under more militant leadership.[72] It was against this tense background that the stoppage

---

Fraser's handling of this issue was criticized on several counts. Left-wing party members alleged that when the issue was raised in caucus and the Prime Minister encountered opposition and a demand for additional information, he went straight to conference, implying that he had full caucus support. When the referendum was held, Fraser was attacked for failing to explore alternative courses before asking for a referendum, and for preventing opponents of compulsory military service from presenting their views. The referendum was held in August; the conference the previous May. Views critical of Fraser are expressed in Frank Langstone, M. P., *Why I Oppose Conscription*, and in Conrad Bollinger, *The Referendum Exposed*, both published by the New Zealand Peace and Anti-Conscription Federation.

[71] There is no provision in the party's constitution for attendance of F.O.L. representatives at caucus meetings and Sec. 19 B would seem to preclude it. Nevertheless, the report of the parliamentary Labor party for 1941 made it clear that there were some occasions when F.O.L. representatives were present.

[72] Even during the war the Waterside Workers had been involved in frequent disputes over the Labor government's stabilization policy, and in 1949 they had supported the Auckland Carpenters in a dispute which the F.O.L. claimed was instigated by Communists. This led to an exchange of acrimonious letters between "Jock" Barnes, leader of the Waterside Workers, and K. Baxter, secretary of the F.O.L. A second issue arose over the Waterside Workers' affiliation with the Maritime Section of the World Federation of Trade Unions, from which the F.O.L. had withdrawn in 1949. The executive of the F.O.L. asked Barnes to withdraw his letter to Baxter and disaffiliate from the Maritime Section of the World Federation of Trade Unions. When he refused, and the action of the executive was upheld by the F.O.L. conference, Barnes led the Watersiders out of

took place, eventually involving more than 20,000 watersiders, freezing workers, seamen, and some others. Lasting for five months, it was the most serious industrial conflict New Zealand had experienced for a generation. The action of the National government was prompt and drastic: the unions were deregistered, emergency regulations were put into effect, members of the armed services moved the goods on the waterfront, and eventually new unions were registered in the separate ports. Once it was clear that the government would take a firm stand, the F.O.L. denounced the leaders of the strike for undermining the arbitration system and refusing to accept the good offices of the F.O.L. in the initial stages of the dispute, and withdrew from the affair.[73]

The strike placed the Labor party in a difficult position. In terms of votes and financial assistance, the Waterside Workers and their allies were important to the party, and Nash represented an electorate in which these workers were strong. Officially the party took no part in the early stages of the dispute. But in April, Nash, with the support of the executive, attempted to bring the warring parties together. This led to an acrimonious exchange between Nash and Baxter, secretary of the F.O.L., who maintained that the belated willingness of the Waterside Workers to arbitrate was a desperate attempt on the part of the militant officers of the union to retain control of the union and use it as a bridgehead for more "disruptive tactics."[74] Nash insisted that his action was in full accord with the Federation's initial insistence upon arbitration, and that since the National government had now taken the position that it would deal only with the newly registered port unions, the basic question had become the preservation of the unity and integrity of the Dominion-wide Waterside Workers' Union.

The strike petered out, the Dominion-wide Waterside Workers' Union was smashed, at least for the time being, and the new port unions were welcomed into the F.O.L.; the Trade Union Congress withered away; the F.O.L. emerged strengthened in prestige. Once again militants had been defeated and were faced with the hard reality that, with the F.O.L. as an ally, the government had forged "an elaborate and deadly technique of action against militant unionism."[75] On the political side, the strike left disunity and recrimination in its wake. A few rejoiced that at long last the party's leader had shown the courage to act independently of Walsh and the F.O.L. But in trying to steer a middle

---

the conference and organized a breakaway Trade Union Congress, including groups of freezing workers, hotel workers, and transport workers, as well as the watersiders. With an initial support of an estimated 75,000 workers, this represented a serious threat to the F.O.L., which had about 200,000 members before the break.

The 1951 strike began when the waterside workers were locked out by their employers after wage negotiations had deadlocked and the workers had refused to work overtime as prescribed by the regulations of the Waterfront Industry Commission.

[73] In view of the earlier differences between the F.O.L. and the Watersiders, it is not surprising that the F.O.L. leaders were content to see the militant leadership of that important group defeated.

[74] *Report of the 14th Annual Conference of the New Zealand Federation of Labor*, 1951.

[75] Leicester Webb, "Trade Unions at the Crossroads: Some Lessons of the New Zealand Strike," *Australian Quarterly*, Vol. 23, No. 4 (Dec., 1951), p. 54.

course, Nash had antagonized the F.O.L. leaders without satisfying the militants. When the adroit prime minister dissolved parliament and precipitated the unexpected election of September 1, 1951, a badly divided Labor party faced the voters. Labor's seats in parliament fell from 34 to 30 and its percentage of the total vote (45.8) was lower than at any time since 1931.[76] It is a chain of events which demonstrates the weakness of the party leaders when differences within the industrial movement erupt, and they lack the support of its leaders.

VI

The present-day New Zealand party, like Labor parties elsewhere, is challenged by serious problems. What is its course to be in a world divided between East and West? How is it to protect itself from penetration by *bona fide* Communists without imposing stultifying restrictions upon its members? Now that so much of what it fought for in the 1930's and 1940's has been won, can it forge a program in tune with the needs of the 1950's? How can it overcome the apathy of a generation which knows nothing of the depression that brought so many into its ranks in an earlier period?

It faces these problems under serious handicaps. Divided ideologically at the outset, it has never developed a firm tradition of resolving its internal differences democratically. The morale of the party is seriously undermined by an undercurrent of disaffection which manifests itself in perpetual guerrilla warfare, but is never resolved in a major encounter. Haunted by the ghost of the Lee rebellion and by the fear of Communist infiltration, leaders lack confidence in the good judgment of the rank and file, and members distrust their leaders. Loss of vitality at the rank and file level has left a vacuum which has been filled in by the leadership group; at the same time tight control from the center contributes to the atrophy of the branches. Dissidents are probably a relatively small minority of the membership, but one reason why they stubbornly refuse to concede defeat is that they feel the dice are heavily loaded against them by dictation from the platform of conference proceedings.

Preoccupation with routine business and the tendency of officers to keep a tight rein on discussion and to discourage ventilation of controversial issues have a deadening effect upon meetings of branches and L.R.C.'s. Direction from the chair may bring the immediate results desired, but it discourages the sense of participation by the rank and file, which can be a great source of strength to parties with their roots in the labor movement.[77] Leaders are justifiably critical of the apathy of members, but indiscriminate use of the label "Communist auxiliary" tends to discourage that free exchange of ideas which might help to inject new life at the branch level. Probably, also, a more challenging and imaginative educational program would stimulate wider discussion of policy matters.

---

[76] See note 10 for these figures.

[77] For a trenchant criticism of the labor movement by an English economist see Dudley Sears, *The Challenge to New Zealand Labour*, a pamphlet published by the Christchurch Co-operative Book Society Ltd., 1946; and Willis Airey, "Andre Siegfried's *Democracy in New Zealand:* Fifty Years After," *Political Science* (N.Z.), Vol. 6, pp. 33–51 (Sept., 1954).

The hostility of some leaders to honest criticism from even democratic left-wing members, as well as the lack of enthusiasum in the branches, creates an atmosphere which antagonizes rather than attracts young intellectuals and idealists who might contribute ideas and leadership for the future. Rebuffed, some of them drop out of the party; others remain within it, shifting their tactics from argument to intrigue. Only a very few join the ranks of the Communists, and there have been no breakaway movements since the ill-fated Lee party.

Because of the close connection between the party and its affiliated unions, the health of one is affected by the health of the other. Analysis of the internal problems of the industrial organizations lies outside the scope of this study, but it should be noted that one hears much the same criticism of the unions and the F.O.L. that one does of the party, and that more vitality in the industrial movement would give the party new vigor.

The generation which shaped Labor's destinies between 1935 and 1949 is rapidly dwindling; only a few of the old guard remain. Walter Nash, the present leader, is over seventy. Most of the ideas for which that generation fought have become facts, and the old energies and slogans are losing their force. But when one looks for the younger men to fill in their vacant ranks and give the party new fervor and sense of direction, few come to mind. Although the socialists of the early 1900's were few in number and vague in their social philosophy, they supplied much of the energy and inspiration of the early Labor party. But the venturesome spirits of today, who might supply the leadership and ideas of tomorrow, are largely rebuffed and silenced. Frustrated and cynical, some of them might well fall prey to unscrupulous and demagogic leaders, thus weakening rather than strengthening the party.[78]

The constitution as amended in 1951 wrote into the party's fundamental law many undemocratic procedures which had been developing for more than a decade. These provisions can be re-written. But it will be more difficult to reverse traditions and habits of thought which lay behind them, and it will be even more difficult to inject new life into the rank and file. Many feel that nothing short of the threat, or the reality, of a major economic depression will arouse the movement from its apathy.

---

[78] Some think that at the present time F. P. Walsh is grooming Moohan, the vice-president of the party, as Nash's successor. Moohan, who was secretary of the party before his election to parliament, was elected vice-president in 1954. A gifted speaker, he is considered by some critics to be an exponent of Catholic reaction and anti-Communism. The sectarian issue has never been as divisive in the New Zealand Labor party as it has been in the Australian Labor party, but in 1952 there was a certain amount of concern by members who felt that the influence of Catholics in the party was growing.

TOWARD A THEORY OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

KENNETH W. THOMPSON
Northwestern University

Recently a group of scholars, analysts, and diplomatists met for a weekend conference on theoretical approaches to international politics.[1] Their discussion was inspired by the widespread and growing interest in conceptual and theoretical problems illustrated by parallel efforts in the study of politics, economics, law, and human relations. In the field of foreign relations the impulse toward theory comes from practitioners as well as philosophers. Indeed a former Secretary of State maintains that our most urgent need is for "an applicable body of theory in foreign policy." Practical men with first-hand diplomatic experience point to the need for rational generalizations and intellectual structures to extract meaning from the jet stream of contemporary events. The intellectual processes by which practical judgments are made along a moving front of events clearly demand inquiry and analysis. Theory in the study of international politics perhaps derserves a special priority because of the urgency of the problem and the stridency of the debate generated by competing approaches each claiming to have preempted the field. Perhaps what is called for is a sorting out and assessment of the intellectual factors that go into diverse theories of international politics at varying levels of abstraction and generality. This sorting out was one of the objectives of the conferees. Similarly this paper seeks to review the nature and purpose of theory, its limitations, and the characteristics of the chief types of theory in international politics.

Until comparatively recently most publicists and scholars had given little thought to formulating a theory of international relations. "Men have generally dealt with international relations on one of three levels, all alien to theory: history, reform, or pragmatic manipulation."[2] History is seldom considered theoretical, for its paramount goal is to illuminate the uniqueness of events. It is true that historians like Ranke have stressed the interdependence of theory and history, ascribing to history the role of checking and illustrating theory and imputing to theory the function of integrating and directing history. However, theory in these terms is seldom explicit; it is almost always fragmentary and implicit in character. "In such historians of international relations, theory is like the skeleton which, invisible to the naked eye, gives form and function to the body."[3] History differs from theory in its resort to a chronological recital of events to demonstrate its oftentimes unavowed theoretical propositions. By comparison, the theorist turns from chronology to modes of analysis that can use the events of widely separated periods despite the fact that their only bond is their relationship to a principle and not proximity in time. History is past politics and as such provides the raw stuff of theory. But fundamentally history and theory are unlike in purpose and in form.

---

[1] Robert Bowie, Dorothy Fosdick, William T. R. Fox, Walter Lippmann, Hans J. Morgenthau, Reinhold Niebuhr, Paul H. Nitze, Don K. Price, James B. Reston, Dean Rusk, Kenneth W. Thompson, and Arnold Wolfers. George F. Kennan was not in attendance but submitted a paper.

[2] Hans J. Morgenthau, unpublished paper, "The Theoretical and Practical Importance of the Theory of International Relations," p. 1.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

Reformers, in contrast to historians, make their theories explicit. They focus, however, on international relations not as they are but as they ought to be. Hence reformers, like historians, are not primarily theoreticians. Practitioners look to the present more than do reformers; statesmen, at least some of the greatest, conceive of international relations in terms of a generalized picture of the international scene. They see concrete cases as examples of more general or theoretical principles. They are inhibited, however, in their concern with the theoretical by the imperatives of practice and policy and only rarely when these immediate demands recede into the background can they afford to make their theories explicit. Statesmanship, as history, can serve as the handmaiden of theory for "those engaged in practice may have insights derived from concentrated experience and thought on the particular nodes where action was significant and possible, which can both assist the theoretician and serve as test checks on his theories."[4] Their practical concerns, however, prevent them from developing theories general enough to account for behavior on the international scene. Only scholars who analyze, compare, and evaluate the words and deeds of leaders like Bismarck, Churchill, or Wilson can uncover the essence of their approach, i.e., their theory.

The Purpose and Functions of Theory. Observers can point to intellectual activities which are not primarily theoretical more readily than they can define or identify theory. Those who assert the possibility of theory for the field of international relations confront the same obstacles, ambiguities, and contradictions on which all past theories of history and politics have suffered shipwreck. The material with which the theorist must deal confounds and frustrates his task at almost every point. The substance of theory is history, composed of unique events and occurrences. An episode in history and politics is in one sense never repeated. It happens as it does only once; it is nonrecurrent in that it has never happened before nor will it be repeated again. In this sense, history is beyond the reach of theory. Underlying all theory, however, is the assumption that these same unique events are also concrete instances of more general propositions. The wholly unique, having nothing in common with anything else, is indescribable, for we know that all analysis (and even description) is made in terms of predicates, class concepts, and repeatable relations. Both recurrence and uniqueness are present in history as in everything else, and the logical difficulty in reconciling them is neither greater nor smaller in international relations than in other fields.

The purpose and function of theory is not to provide a "substitute for the art of decision-making in foreign affairs, which, in view of the infinite number of combinations of multitudes of variables that form any concrete solution, must always remain in part a matter of risky choices based on more or less rational hunches."[5] Theory may serve to enhance the rationality of choice of decision-makers by helping them in the articulation of a more fully consistent view of the factors of the external environment. Yet the statesman is bound to a world of contingencies and pressures. He must express his philosophy from time to time as rough guides and rules-of-thumb that can only be limited and restricted in character. Whether this is a permanent condition, the conference was not agreed. It was suggested that the field of medicine offers an interesting parallel to decision-making. The medicine man of an earlier age was turned into physician as philosophical and scientific inquiry gave him new insights and resources. In the same way the policy-maker today is handicapped by the fact that his rough generalizations are sometimes drawn from a single experience. With better data and more accurate theories he can become more nearly "a physician of policy." It should be noted that this analogy was not accepted by those members of the conference who resisted the notion that the realms of nature and human behavior can readily be equated.

---

[4] Paul H. Nitze, unpublished paper, "The Implications of Theory for Practice in the Conduct of Foreign Affairs," p. 4.

The function of theory as conceived and discussed by the participants is threefold. First, and perhaps most basic, it makes possible the ordering of data. It is a useful tool for understanding. It provides a framework for systematic and imaginative hypothesizing. It gives order and meaning to a mass of phenomena which without it would remain disconnected and unintelligible. This function is one emphasized particularly by Professors Fox and Morgenthau. The ordering of data can help the observer to distinguish uniformities and uniquenesses. In one scheme of analysis, for instance, it helps us to understand and distinguish the relatively fixed, the changing but uncontrollable, and the manipulatable aspects of world politics. In another, it guides us in considering the manifold social configurations of politics by offering an organizing principle founded on the most distinctive characteristic of politics, the struggle for power. Theory holds out the tools whereby the observer can discover in the welter of events that which is recurrent and typical. It satisfies man's need for intellectual orientation in a vital sector of existence.

Second, theory requires that the criteria of selection of problems for intensive analysis be made explicit. It is not always recognized that whenever a particular problem is selected for study and analysis in some context or other, there is practically always a theory underlying the choice. The idea of a presuppositionless social science has often been warmly embraced by prominent and aggressive research groups, but has tended more to mislead than to clarify the true nature of most research. It must be obvious that while social scientists should steel themselves to be as objective as possible, the notion that one band of observers goes about its task with a heavy baggage of biases and preferences whereas another starts free from all theories and presumptions is of course a grotesque caricature of social studies. Theory can serve to make more fully explicit the implicit assumptions underlying a research design and thus bring out dimensions and implications that might otherwise be overlooked.

---

[5] Arnold Wolfers, unpublished paper, "Theory of International Politics: Its Merits and Advancement," p. 1.

Third, theory can be an instrument for understanding not only uniformities and regularities but contingencies and irrationalities as well. It can make possible "the creative elaboration of fruitful hypotheses which bear on the relationship between specified variables."[6] In modern politics there is a need for specific knowledge of contingent factors. It is argued, for example, that an anatomy of tyranny that deals only with general laws and similarities cannot adequately illuminate the differences between a nihilistic philosophy like nazism and a utopian one like communism. Present-day ideologies and revolutionary forces are variables that complicate the traditional roles of the major powers and must therefore be seen as they relate to other constants and variables. The function that theory serves will be determined by the problem and the intellectual interest of the observer.

The Nature and Content of Theory. The content of theory is also a consequence of the particular aim and interest of the student. The author of one of the papers for the conference suggests that at least four elements should go to make up a comprehensive theory.[7] The first element in a theory must be the "givens" on the world political scene, such as the ruling conception of politics, the geographic factors, and aggregates of natural resources. Another element involves long-run basic changes, such as the rise of nationalism or the spread of the coal-and-iron technology. A third element, not to be overlooked, consists of the contingencies consequent upon state policies over which comparatively little rational control is assured. The policies of other states and of one's own state as they are shaped and influenced by domestic forces and political systems are illustrative. A fourth element concerns those areas of choice involving levels of preparedness, patterns of alliances, and use of organizations for peaceful change that arise as part of a free and rational decision-making process. A theory that included these four elements would exhaust the basic relevant factors of international politics.

In practice, of course, no single existing theory at any significant level of abstraction does justice to all these elements. Insofar as the variables and contingencies of international politics can be understood and discussed at all, it is as concrete and limited theoretical propositions. For instance, the irrationalities of state policies over which we can have little rational control stem in part from the tendencies of differing forms of political organization. If we introduce the notion that totalitarian governments consistently overestimate their own power and underestimate that of others, we are dealing with a specific theoretical problem. Theory in its present state cannot handle complex bodies of variables in any complete sense. There are specific theoretical statements which can be observed and tested, however, and the resulting findings can be employed in the building of more complex theoretical models.

---

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

[7] William T. R. Fox, unpublished paper, "International Relations Theory and Areas of Choice in Foreign Policy," p. 3.

We are still left with the dilemma of uniqueness and recurrence unless we can arrive at a more coherent view of the nature of a theory of international relations. It should be clear that the influence of public opinion and domestic politics on foreign policy is always uncertain, usually unpredictable, and rarely subject to significant theorizing. By contrast, the choices that are open to a policy-maker in formulating a nation's foreign policy are in general limited in character and rooted in the historic policies that his predecessors have followed. The choices of statesmen are limited by the range of national objectives; national interest is susceptible of theoretical understanding. The fact is inescapable that individuals with quite different personal and political philosophies, like Bevin and Churchill in England or Acheson and Dulles in this country, conduct foreign policies that in practice are similar if not identical in basic objectives. This fact makes a theory of international relations possible. It reflects the rational character of international relations uniting the observer, the statesman, and the international scene.

"A theory of international relations is a rationally ordered summary of all the rational elements which the observer has found in the subject matter. Such a theory is a kind of rational outline of international relations, a map of the international scene."[8] It is grounded in the assumption that foreign policy is pursued by leaders who if successful must be conscious of objectives which are essential to national security. Because of this characteristic, it is possible for the political analyst and historian to retrace the steps of past decision-makers and anticipate those of statesmen of the future to the extent that state behavior is rational. The national interest is the least common denominator of rational foreign policy and the most general level of theoretical understanding. Everyone is of course aware that nations are in practice deflected from a rational course by errors of judgment and emotional preferences. A theory of international relations thus points to the contrast between the empirical reality of the international scene and what it tends inherently to be but can never completely become. The difference between a wholly empirical and a theoretical conception of international relations is like the difference between a photograph and a painted portrait. "The photograph shows everything that can be seen by the naked eye. The painted portrait does not show everything that can be seen by the naked eye, but it shows one thing that the naked eye cannot see: the human essence of the person portrayed."[9]

A theory which deals with the rational elements of international politics can come to terms with the "givens" in the world political equation, the long-run basic changes, and the areas of choice in foreign policy. It can take account of the areas of state policy over which there can be slight control—such as domestic politics—only by showing how through these influences actors can be deflected from the course that rational theory would indicate they should follow. Theory provides a base or fixed point upon which analysis can be founded in the face of irrationalities and contingencies that no theory can deal with at this stage of our intellectual development.

---

[8] Morgenthau, p. 5.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

The Limitations of Theory. Thus theory can at best portray the essence of international politics. The practitioner who must labor in the vineyard of empirical reality, however, finds its functions limited for him in a threefold way. In the practitioner's realm thinking must focus on concrete actions, while theory attempts to deal with a full continuum of thought. No one theory can be adequate or relevant to all his tasks. The subject matter of theory and practice is essentially ambiguous, and the practitioner is often required to take up where the theorist, because of his material, is obliged to leave off.

The first limitation is possibly the most serious. Some decision-makers prefer "to prick out a policy" case by case. They are distrustful of formal theory which is often too general for their purposes. They are skeptical about carrying any theory too far. They point out that "a wrong theory, an oversimplified theory, or a theory applied out of context can produce disastrous results."[10] Too often theory gives no apparent guide-line for practice and the best the policy-maker can do is to avoid commitments that would oppose a new line of action if the first fails to work out.

Another persistent obstacle to the application of theory in practice is the inherent limitation of any one theory. Even for the scholar "no one theory may be equally accurate in explaining the cycle of peace and war, the rise and fall of great states, the extent to which the future is already implicit in the past, why certain states are 'great powers' and so forth."[11] Yet even if such a theory were intellectually possible, it might not be particularly useful in aiding the statesman having to deal, for instance, with the threat of a Russo-German coalition. For his purposes, a theory of less architectonic proportions which revealed something about historic Russian and German foreign policy could be more helpful.

The theorist, as we have seen, faces problems that set inherent limits to this task. He works with materials consisting of events that are at the same time unique and repetitive. Two events may be alike in certain respects; they will never be alike in all respects. He must ask himself how these differences affect the validity of a theoretical proposition derived from either one of them. Professor Morgenthau illustrates the problem in these terms:

> We might have learned from one situation that it is wrong to make concessions to an imperialistic nation or to intervene in a war between two other nations. Obviously, it cannot follow that one ought never to make concessions to an imperialistic nation nor intervene in a war between two other nations. A theoretical proposition is correct only under the assumption that all the relevant elements in the situation which have given rise to it are present in another situation and that no new circumstances are intervening, modifying their relevance.[12]

[10] Nitze, p. 2.

[11] Fox, pp. 1–2.

[12] Morgenthau, p. 4.

Yet who can say with absolute certainty that all essential elements unaltered by circumstances are present in two situations? It was wrong, we say, to make concessions to German imperialism. Is it equally wrong to yield at any point to Russian imperialism or to Chinese imperialism? Is Churchill's plea for a conference "at the summit" no less mistaken than Chamberlain's "Peace in our Time"? The Nazi will to power was a form of the general will to power, yet it was also unique in its fanaticism. Wisdom develops with the awareness of the presence of both constants and unique events on the historical scene. Theory confronted by ambiguities which call it into question at every turn must guard against taking itself too seriously. Often the best the theorist, no less than the diplomat, can do is to play by ear and be satisfied with a series of hunches.

If this is the fate of theory, there is a point at which theory and practice join hands in a common task. That the judgment and wisdom of the practitioner are the fruits of a pragmatic conception of theory is sometimes overlooked. This in spite of the fact that a prominent policy planner can say in reviewing the formulation of foreign policy: "Facts must be ordered to bring out significant generalizations; assumptions have to be made as to the probable causal interrelations between diverse factors; judgments must be made as to the hierarchy of values and of objectives."[13] Yet the relationship between theorists and policy-makers in the past has not been too creative. Theorists sometimes imply that those engaged in practice are lacking in original and valid insights and exempt from broader intellectual influences. Practitioners in turn maintain that a wrong theory can be worse than no theory at all. They regret that academic scribblers often philosophize at a level of abstraction and generality that so frequently is irrelevant for their task.

However, the limitations of theory inherent in the ambiguity of its materials encourage wider contacts between theorists and practitioners. Theory must have some place for the intuitive understanding of contingent factors in concrete situations. No one deals more continuously than the policy-maker with these contingencies in relation to the constants of international life. Theory attempts to deal with a broad continuum of thought, whereas the decision-maker faced with concrete problems must work at nodal points on the continuum. A theory is as good as the repeated evidence of its validity. On this theorists and practitioners appear to agree. A theorist can say: "Analytical propositions, whatever the theoretical framework in which they are placed, which purport to 'explain' have first to be subjected to empirical testing and then reformulated to take account of the difference between the theoretical model and the actual observation."[14] A practitioner believes that through insights derived from concentrated experience the validity of theory at important points on a continuum may be tested.[15] The deductive intuition of the practitioner coupled with the empirical context within which he operates will be recognized as an important tool of theory only when the nature and limitations of theory are more fully perceived.

---

[13] Nitze, p. 1.

[14] Fox, p. 5.

[15] Nitze, p. 4.

Types of Theory. Walter Lippmann, speaking from a rich familiarity with both theory and practice, reminded the conference of the existence of at least three forms of theory. Normative theory is one form. Another form could be a general theory of politics. He noted: "There might or might not be a general theory that will tell you how the world will behave whether you like it or not. And another use of the word theory concerns theory, conscious or unconscious, on which a man, nation, or government is acting."[16] Mr. Lippmann observed that behind almost every act is an implict theory. It is useful and important to know more about this field. The conferees adopted Mr. Lippmann's formulation and went on to discuss in some detail the three types of theory.

1. *Normative Theory.* Normative theory is the study of politics in terms of ethical desiderata. It is perhaps alarming that political scientists, by allegedly confining themselves to the study of facts as contrasted with values, so often fail to take stock of this realm. The scientific approach blunts the fact that ethics and purpose relate to practical matters. The conferees agreed that it is blatant hypocrisy to say that the study of ends, purposes, and values is not a field of theory. They affirmed that we need a theory for the evaluation of norms as they are evolving in society. We need to consider the nature and content of national purposes and objectives at crucial points in our history. We need to understand the processes and standards of moral discrimination and the criteria by which we measure good and evil. We must perceive the levels at which normative thinking is necessary and possible and the hierarchy of values in a society. We need to face the moral issue in the peculiar context of international relations.

"The moral issue is so persistently raised, both in the theory and in the practical conduct of international affairs, not only because men honestly seek to do the right in their collective, as well as in their individual, life; but because they cannot follow their interest without claiming to do so in obedience to some general scheme of values."[17] This invites the two baffling and inescapable problems of moral pretension and moral cynicism. Nations are more inclined than individuals to follow their own interests; the imperatives of national security and survival require the statesman to distinguish his personal and public responsibilities. There is no clearer and more poignant example than Lincoln's subordination of his private views on slavery to the goal of the preservation of the Union. Nations always pretend to have a purer devotion to morality than they actually have. They are not as pure in their actions as they claim to be in their intentions. Moral pretension arises from the claims of a nation that it has acted not from self-interest or national security but in obedience to some higher purpose like "civilization" or "justice." When the conduct of foreign policy is democratic, this tendency increases rather than diminishes. Some authorites say that those responsible for postwar American foreign policy have claimed more benevolence for our policies than they deserve. This pretension inevitably arouses the resentments of people who envy our wealth and fear our power. In France and Asia, in the conduct of the Marshall Plan, and with Technical Assistance, we are sometimes accused of "compounding the sin of imperialism with the sin of hypocrisy." The antidote to pretension may be to remind ourselves that "though the exercise of our hegemony is a splendid example of the application of a wise self-interest when informed by loyalty to principles transcending national interests, it is important not to claim too much for the moral quality of our policies."[18] The moral issue in international relations consists as much in moderating moral pretensions as in erecting norms for man's collective life.

---

[16] Transcript of Conference, p. 5.

[17] Reinhold Niebuhr, unpublished paper, "The Moral Issue in International Relations," p. 1.

Yet hypocrisy is "the inevitable by-product in the life of any nation which has some loyalty to moral principles, but whose actions do not fully conform to those principles. The price of eliminating those hypocrisies entirely is to sink into a consistent cynicism in which moral principles are not operative at all.[19] We might ask ourselves if it is significant that over the last decade no United Nations delegation has spoken out against the Charter, and in particular against the aims and purposes set forth in Articles 1 and 2. Is it true that national interest involves a range of concerns inclusive not only of specific geographical and power objectives but also of the world system and standards of behavior under which we can act most effectively? Is moral cynicism assuaged by the loyalties of peoples operative in their moral life to prevent the national interest from being conceived too narrowly and selfishly? Ought we to strive to make more rigorous distinctions between what is possible for governments inescapably accountable for security and survival, and the people at large whose ends may transcend national boundaries? Does this awareness present both the problem of reducing popular enthusiasm to the limits of practical statesmanship and the possibility of encouraging the state to find the point of concurrence between its interests and the more universal interest? Has this sensitivity marked the difference between German policies, when they have ostentatiously rejected moral principles if they did not serve concrete selfish interests, as compared with appeals to moral principles by the English inviting at the same time hypocrisy and those qualities institutionalized and preserved in a Commonwealth of nations?[20]

Nations display a continued ambivalence, claiming in one moment to hold moral obligations without regard to selfish interests and in the next moment insisting that only security and survival govern their conduct. Nations are not often subject to the idea that "He that loseth his life shall find it." Yet there is some general impulse behind self-interest illustrated and exaggerated by the Utilitarian presumption that "a wise man determines his interest so broadly that it includes everybody's." In the face of the moral anguish revealed by this ambivalence, what is the role of normative theory? In plain words, what would a normative theory look like amidst the bewildering issues of modern international life? One American theologian has ventured to give some form and content to such a theory and the conference turned its attention briefly to the main elements of his conception of a normative theory.

---

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

[20] "One could make similar comparisons between the inevitable pretensions involved in our failure to realize the 'American Dream' in our race relations, so poignantly described in Myrdal's *American Dilemma*, and the consistent realism and unhyprocritical cruelty of the South African approach to this problem." *Ibid.*, p. 5.

For Reinhold Niebuhr, the theorist must come to grips with his subject on at least two levels. In the more ultimate dimension of pure morality, he must face the questions of the source and content of moral standards and the nature of a definition of the good. At the level of a proximate political and social morality, he must deal with the factors of interest and power. Niebuhr rejects what he considers the Aristotelian attempt to define the good as "conformity to a pre-established ontological pattern of being." Instead he insists on looking for a more flexible definition of the good and finds it in Santayana's phrase "the harmony of the whole which does not destroy the vitality of the parts." The unique vitality and freedom of the parts and the harmony that results when the coercive force of tyranny does not decisively constrain them provide the criterion of moral value. Justice or the good is possible when liberty and equality are preserved.

Social or political justice, however, is attainable in a context where community or order must prevail, and the organization of any community, whether national or international, demands the inevitable subordination of one man to another or the parts to the whole. Liberty and equality in the political context become regulative principles, not simple possibilities. Justice in concrete international situations involves "giving each man his due." We arrive through the process of endless discrimination, debate, and what philosophers call political prudence at a tolerably acceptable concept of man's due wherein general principles provide us with at most rough guides to action.

Liberty is a proposition that arises in western culture because of the Christian and Hebraic traditions. Nevertheless a proposition that is true transcends its presuppositions and Nehru, for example, who prefers to reject western presuppositions, demands liberty for India. Liberty, it appears, is an inevitable norm or regulative principle without being sufficient in itself. National self-determination became an absolute, co-extensive with justice, for some post-World I western statesmen. It led to the breakdown of the European economy when it obscured the harmonizing role that had been played by the Austro-Hungarian Empire. It brought on a resentful and impractical order. In a situation characterized by the choice between self-determination and order, the statesman can only play by ear. Similarly, too much equality may sometimes be an evil. Those nations who oppose the United States today because it has too much power conceal the fact that without American power western civilization might be destroyed.

Put in more general terms: "Political morality contains an inevitable ambiguity because the factors of interest and power, which are regarded as an irrelevance in pure morality, must be at least tentatively admitted to the realm of social morality. Self-interest may be a source of discord ultimately; but it is tentatively necessary to prevent the harmony of the whole from destroying the vitality of the parts."[21] Power can serve as a counter-weight against power in the interests of justice. It may facilitate coercion when the order of a community is in danger. Tyranny is sometimes more desirable than chaos. For instance, some observers maintain that the sole alternative to chaos in some Far Eastern countries has been tyranny. Moreover, the legitimacy of a traditional society that is in a state of neither tyranny nor chaos but is governed by custom, myth, or tradition confronts the west with yet another alternative. It is clear that the good is some kind of harmony, but the emphasis in normative theory must ultimately be on the *kind* of harmony. Specifically, in normative terms it must be a particular kind of harmony that includes equality and liberty.

---

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

In view of the infinite contingencies in the historical situation, a normative theory cannot take on more content or body than is possessed by these regulative principles. An historical situation cannot produce a theory which can tell you how much you should trust the future against the present or the past against the present or future. A good theory would have to recognize the existential fact of the difference between interests and ideals. It could clarify the assumption in a democracy that the resort to violence is immoral. It might help nations avoid ideological taint, as when they formalize their own national principles into the contractual rules of international relations. It might provide an estimate of the cost of one set of values as against another. It could test the efficiency of a given set of means for the achievement of a particular end. It would help statesmen find the point where the general good and the national interest come together—if they do.

In his paper, George F. Kennan reminded the group that the conduct of foreign relations ought not be conceived of as an end in itself, but rather as one of the means through which a higher purpose was preserved. Foreign policy, in brief, is a means to an end. He argued that among the overall purposes of sovereign states had been the glorification of dynasties, the fostering and employment of military virtues, and the spread of a particular social theory. The object of this government for the founding fathers was to serve as a means for protecting the individual in his exercise of certain rights, including life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The problem of foreign policy amounted simply to determining what could be done in the handling of foreign relations to promote these objects. The first answer was to safeguard the national soil from military or political intrusion, for only if the nation's security was upheld could the political processes of freedom be preserved. Secondly, it called for the protection and assistance of our citizens when their activities spilled over beyond the national boundaries. These two functions—promoting national security and private American activities abroad—were all that flowed directly from the original objects of American society. Foreign policy in these terms was moderate, restrained, and ever attuned to the realities and limits of power.

All this was to change with the twentieth century. A posture deriving strictly from the objectives of society ceased to be satisfying when a spirit of romanticism seized the nation. We began to flaunt the American dream. We were content with our expanded borders. We chose to picture the rest of the world as of necessity as content as we were. All that was needed for world peace was a set of contractual relations whereby this happy status quo might be formalized and preserved. A world parliament, constitution, and framework of treaties of arbitration and conciliation would do for others what their national models had done for us. The cultivation of these utopian schemes, flattering to the nation's image of itself, took place at the cost of our feeling for reality. We closed our eyes to the menacing realities of ambition and power.

A normative theory calling for clarity on the objects and purposes of society might help states to remember what was basic to their national lives and to distinguish among a society's means and ends. It is barely possible that the element of moral pretension may be a more consistent cause of conflict between nations than the competition between frankly avowed national interests. Normative theory causes men to cross the threshold to wider questions of philosophy and ontology, for "moral pretension is but one aspect of the general inclination of modern men, who are undoubtedly agents in history, to forget that they are also creatures in the very historical process in which they must take responsible action.[22]

2. *A General Theory of International Politics.* The prospects of a general theory of international politics are foreshadowed in our earlier discussion. The ambiguity of historical experience presents students of both normative or general theory with a welter of data from which to choose. The events he essays to compare and evaluate are at one and the same time unique and similar. It is only because historical experience contains an element of normality, regularity, and rationality that we can understand it as a continuum susceptible to abstraction and generalization. The pitfall of theory is obviously one of distinguishing by means of appropriate criteria of selection and relevance the repetitive from the unique. The conference was somewhat at odds on the point of the level at which a general theory was most likely to transcend these obstacles and difficulties.

---

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 7. Paul Nitze in a recent address to the National Council of Churches puts the moral issue in a new and original setting. Mr. Nitze concedes that the immediate object of our foreign policy must be the fostering and elaboration of an international environment in which nations organized as we are can prosper and survive. The means to this end must be the development of the influence and power of ourselves and our friends and the reduction of the power of our enemies. Yet the men in the Kremlin hold precisely the same aim. Mr. Nitze notes: "The basic moral issue would seem to arise from the question of the ends to which power is dedicated, the means with which it is pursued and the attitude informing the entire endeavor." He quotes John Adams who enunciated a system of values hierarchically arranged as constituting the American spirit of patriotism. The highest level he reserved for piety, or the love and fear of God, and a general benevolence to mankind. The second level he assigned to the attachment to country and a zeal to promote, reform, and improve it. The third involved the prejudices and wishes of individuals or parties. Nitze concludes: "It is the absence of consideration for the first or highest level in Leninist-Stalinist doctrine and the substitution therefor of the third level in the form of absolute claims of a particular party, which underlies our confidence that it is possible to make moral distinctions between our attitude and that of the Communists." The lines of convergence between national interest and the welfare of mankind are not always clear. It is necessary always to pay heed to the context of decisions. For instance, we are asked how we reconcile our position against colonialism with support of the French in Indo-China and North Africa. How reconcile our fight against fascism with military talks with Franco? Or hatred of communism with support of Tito? Or encouragement of the enslaved peoples of Central Europe with the refusal to go to war to liberate them? Are we sacrificing a higher principle to a lower or more immediate end in each of these instances? If one looks at each problem in its context it is difficult to see "the long-term higher principle or end which could be served by increasing Ho Chi Min's sway in Southeast Asia, in driving Tito into the arms of the Kremlin, in isolating Spain or in going into a general war to liberate the oppressed peoples of Central Europe." This is a practitioner's concept of normative theory.

It was maintained by some participants that theory is possible only at the level of general abstractions on the rational character of international politics. If the theorist attempts to become too specific, he is confronted with experiences for which general laws or principles cannot be successfully erected. The unique occurrences in history are accidental and display no element of rationality. There are, however, events in history that show a rational sequence and causal relationship; for these events, observation and generalization is possible. The practical application of some general principles that are tenable at one level may be difficult. Take the principle of Machiavelli that one should "never make an alliance with a stronger nation." The calamitous experiences of the Italian and Greek city states when they departed from this principle provide evidence of its relevance. At the level of practice, however, there are circumstances where weaker nations probably are obliged to make such alliances even though there is a basic uniformity between their situation and that of the city states. The most rational approach is highly discriminatory in relation to the real situation we can know. Principles or "laws" in a general theory partake of many of the same qualities as regulative principles in normative theory. The benefits which flow from over-abstraction were discussed. Several discussants noted that sometimes the "maximizing procedure" in theory was essential, as when one assumes that the USSR wishes to maximize its power and then traces the variables—for example, recent changes in Soviet tactics.

This approach to theory was vigorously challenged by proponents of another view. Spokesmen of this other approach argued that what is lacking in theory today is "the predictability and variability of concepts and thinking." They argued for the behavioral social sciences and pointed to recent successes in the classification of behavior. Theory is no less rational when it employs a great number of variables than when it deals with single variables. Special criticism was leveled at pernicious abstractions that characterize "Britain" or "France" as real entities (reification). Far more complex models, based on the irrationality of a multitude of actors, must be constructed. Instead of looking at the essence of statehood, the observer should consider the "human element." Individuals have loyalties that ramify through the varieties of human communities including the family, church, or labor union; the state is merely one datum point on this spectrum. This approach insists upon dealing with specific, middle-range theoretical problems subject to testing and research. For example, theorists might study the proposition that "totalitarian governments overestimate their own power and underestimate the power of others." Or "democratic governments are influenced by the assumption that peace is more desirable than violence." In the present state of thinking, these problems present theorists with the challenge to come down from the highest level of abstraction and confront problems more concrete in character. The emphasis is upon empirical verification, use of insights from other social sciences, and model building at a more sophisticated level. Here "behavioral or psychological aspects centering on the unmistakable existence of individual persons and methodological problems . . . [are] pushed to the fore."[23]

---

[23] Wolfers, p. 4.

The swing of the pendulum toward a full-fledged behavioral science of international behavior may have led to the neglect of the situational components of international relations. The hiatus currently existent between the two major approaches to a general theory has left fallow ground unplowed by either group. Studying the relatively changeless features of a nation's foreign policy or the more or less objective factors of the international landscape provides a fixed point of reference. When individuals with quite different political philosophies conduct foreign policies which are similar or even identical in basic objectives, the situation of international politics has clearly imposed direction and limitations upon the actors. Theorists who may be prone to conceive of foreign policy as a mere reflection of the political philosophies or irrationality of particular actors would do well to inquire into substantive problems cast up by the social forces and conditions of the external environment. In turn, those who begin with general principles about major foreign powers should not be oblivious of changing or unique factors. For instance, the theorist must recognize communism as a unique factor influencing historic Russian policies. A closer union between the philosophical and behavioral approaches might go a long way toward solving the unfinished business of current theoretical work.

3. *Theory as the Basis for Action.* A third type of theory concerns the relationship between the assumptions or theories of statesmen and their conduct of foreign policy. Such an approach attempts to clarify the connection and interrelation between words and deeds through the theoretical treatment of historical personalities and their policies. Inquiries of this kind throw light on the vacillation between idealism and realism in American theory and practice. What is the relationship between the two and what are the decisive elements which make them different? What were the tragic choices in Lincoln's political life arising from this conflict, or in the policies of Adams or Hamilton? A significant analysis might cut both ways to lay bare the illusions in the American tendency to think that history is more malleable than it is (idealism) or that it is characterized by certain immutable laws (realism). The fascination and appeal of the intellectual trend inherent in this approach to theory is its close relevance and application to history as over against the remoteness of pure conceptualization.

The Present State of Theory. The present state of theory in the field of international politics is compounded of vigorous debate, intellectual growth, and little unanimity on points of detail. Only the tyranny of intellectual life would be served by installing one approach as pre-eminent. Theory without verification is metaphysics. Mere empiricism and classification without theory cannot but be aimless. The lines of convergence of the practical and theoretical are clear for all to see—assuming that the worthy character of a wide range of intellectual activity is recognized and accepted. The needs of the field are so striking that the best efforts of our most seminal and powerful minds cannot exceed the challenge. A spirit of mutual respect must increasingly animate good theoretical work.

INDIAN AND WESTERN POLITICAL THOUGHT: COALESCENCE OR CLASH?*

NORMAN D. PALMER
University of Pennsylvania

American political scientists are still teaching courses labeled "Comparative Government" with little or no attention to the government and politics of the largest states of the world today, and they are still teaching something called "Political Theory" or "History of Political Thought" with no more than casual reference to the ideas underlying non-Western civilizations. The neglect of Indian polity[1] is particularly striking and particularly serious, for apart from Western political thought it comprises probably the most extensive and most important body of political philosophy. Moreover, it is an integral part of the Hindu civilization of the past and the present. That civilization, as Radhakrishnan and Toynbee, among others, have pointed out, is alien to Western civilization, although there are many similarities; and the present encounter between the two civilizations comes at a time when both are in a period of crisis and transition. Such considerations are basic to an understanding of the stresses and strains in the relations of India with the Western world. Behind the tensions that arise between the United States and India, for example, lie differences in views of life and modes of thought and conduct, complicated by uncertainty, inner struggle, sensitivity, misunderstanding, and inexperience in playing new and difficult roles.

According to Arnold Toynbee, most of the world's civilizations, past and present, have been non-Western. Three of the five surviving civilizations in his list—the Islamic, the Hindu, and the Far Eastern—are non-Western, and another—the Orthodox Christian—has absorbed many non-Western characteristics. Moreover, Western Christendom "is a product of Christianity" which "arose outside the limits of Western Christendom, in a district that lies today within the domain of a different civilization: Islam."[2] Of all the surviving civilizations, the Hindu differs most fundamentally from the Western Christian, and yet it is the civilization which has experienced the most intimate, and in many ways the most disturbing, contact with the West.[3] Those who are interested in understanding and in interpreting the nature of the present world crisis can profit from a study of the encounter between the Western Christian and the

---

* This paper was first presented at the fiftieth annual meeting of the American Political Science Association in Chicago, Sept. 9, 1954. For helpful suggestions and advice I am particularly indebted to the members of the panel who discussed the paper at this meeting, and also to Professor N. G. D. Joardar, Miss Indira Nalin, and Mr. S. P. Singh.

[1] An examination of any basic text in political theory will provide ample proof of this neglect. The same conclusion will be reached from a review of past programs of the American Political Science Association.

[2] Arnold Toynbee, "Civilization on Trial," *Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 179, pp. 34–38 (June, 1947).

[3] Arnold Toynbee, *The World and the West* (New York, 1953), Ch. 3, "India and the West."

Hindu civilizations. Actually, three of the five surviving civilizations have met in the Indian subcontinent, for Islam too has had a powerful impact in that part of the world. Thus in the so-called struggle between East and West, India is an area of very special significance.

At this point a word of caution is necessary. All references to "East" and "West" and to the differences between "civilizations" are largely for purposes of convenience in analysis. They are artificial at best, and they may lead to unwarranted generalizations and serious misunderstandings. The East speaks with many voices, as does the West; in fact, all efforts to distinguish between East and West, and to generalize about the nature of Eastern and Western political thought, are bound to be unsatisfactory. Some leading thinkers of both East and West—Radhakrishnan and Northrop, to name two out of many—have attempted to draw such distinctions; but perhaps the viewpoint of P. Kodanda Rao is more tenable:

> The concept of a Western civilization and an Eastern civilization is . . . invalid. There are no two great civilizations to start with. The question of their relations and the need to reconcile them does not, therefore, arise. The proposal to do so makes as much sense as, say, a proposal to reconcile the difference between London and Saturday![4]

In another connection the same student of culture has declared: "The whole world, and not any part thereof, is the unit for ideas, and history is continuous. Humanity as a whole can be proud vicariously of the achievements of any individual human being."[5]

Such concepts should be borne in mind in any consideration of Indian and Western political thought, and in any attempt to discover the distinctive features of Indian polity. After all, can such adjectives as "Western" and "Indian" be applied to political thought? If so, what are the real bases of similarity and of difference? Clearly the Western impact on Indian political thought has been great, and in all probability India has contributed more to Western political thinking than is generally realized. The study of Western political ideas, which have been the subjects of endless inquiry, still presents problems of emphasis and of interpretation. These problems are even more acute for Indian political thought, the study of which is in its infancy.

A penetrating work on Eastern Europe, published in 1953, ended on this note: "For the West can interpret the West; it can only describe the East."[6] In this period of tensions between Asia and the West, and of the growing importance of Asia in the world, description is not enough. The West must try to understand and interpret as well as to describe. It may be that the road-blocks in the path of interpretation and understanding lie in the recesses of the Western political mind rather than in the inscrutable maze of Oriental mysticism.

---

[4] P. Kodanda Rao, "The Laws of Culture," *The Aryan Path*, Vol. 23, pp. 504–8 (Nov., 1952).

[5] P. Kodanda Rao, commentary on this paper at the APSA meeting in Chicago, Sept. 9, 1954.

[6] John A. Lukacs, *The Great Powers in Eastern Europe* (New York. 1953), p. 700.

I

Less than a century ago, Professor Max Müller declared: "The Hindus were a nation of philosophers. Their struggles were the struggles of thought; their past, the problem of creation; their future, the problem of existence. . . . It might therefore be justly said that India has no place in the political history of the world."[7] Fifty-three years ago Professor William A. Dunning wrote: "The Oriental Aryans never freed their politics from the theological and metaphysical environment in which it is embedded today."[8] These views are understandable in the light of the orientation of the authors, the primitive state of Indic studies, the difficulty of isolating political ideas from the mainstream of Hindu philosophy, and the lack of qualified scholars in the political field who were interested in the thought of ancient India. Today, however, such views can hardly be entertained by serious and objective scholars. With the discovery and translation of Kautilya's *Arthaśāstra* by Dr. R. Shamasastry, approximately half a century ago, the translation and publication of additional Sanskrit texts and other source materials, and the appearance of several important treatises on ancient Indian political thought, there is no longer much excuse for the neglect of this significant portion of the political thinking of mankind. Far from having no place in the political history of the world, as Max Müller concluded, India should have a major place, perhaps on the Elysian heights alongside ancient Greece and England. In ancient India, as Professor Gettell noted thirty years ago, "Political philosophy was recognized as a distinct field of knowledge, created an extensive literature, and was considered by some of its founders the most important of sciences."[9] Although Professor Gettell showed an awareness of the nature and importance of the subject, he devoted only two pages out of five hundred to Hindu political thought, about the same amount of space as he gave to anarchism and to two Italian jurists of the late eighteenth century.

At the present time the tendency of Indian political scientists, and of a large number of foreign commentators, is to be unduly critical of Western civilization, thought, and traditions and to make extravagant claims regarding Indian culture and thought. This attitude is reflected in what is probably the most important contribution by an Indian political scientist in recent years in the field of political theory—K. P. Mukerji's *The State.* In this book the head of the political science department of Bombay University, who studied in Germany under Walter Jellinek, extols "the *varnashramic* philosophy of ancient India" and belabors Western political thought for its lack of a background of

---

[7] Max Müller, *History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature* (London, 1859), p. 31. It need hardly be emphasized that the great German philologist and Orientalist who edited the *Rig-Veda* and many other ancient Hindu classics was profoundly impressed with the Indian contribution to civilization. In one of his lectures at Cambridge University he declared " . . . in that study of the history of the human mind, . . . India occupies a place second to no other country." Max Müller, *India: What Can It Teach Us?* (London, 1883), p. 13.

[8] William A. Dunning, *A History of Political Theories, Ancient and Medieval* (New York, 1902), p. xix.

[9] Raymond G. Gettell, *History of Political Thought* (New York, 1924), p. 28.

"synthetic political philosophy" and for its alleged indifference "to the problems of philosophy and morals." He sees hope, however, in "the unconscious longing of western intellectuals for the Hindu view of life and law," and he believes that "the assumed postulates of western thinkers . . . are the same as those of the ancient Hindus which ultimately represent a faith in natural law or eternal *dharma*."[10] In less scholarly publications the claims are even more extravagant. Writing in *The Times of India* a few years ago, Dr. C. N. Zutshi asserted: "There is not a single political theory or institution adopted by European countries which had not been anticipated in ancient India. Rather, European nations have modelled politics on the basic theories furnished by India." Some foreign Orientalists have also suggested that the West should turn to ancient India for guidance and enlightenment. The first sentence of Dr. Heinrich Zimmer's great work on *Philosophies of India*, for example, reads: "We of the Occident are about to arrive at a crossroads that was reached by the thinkers of the India some seven hundred years before Christ."

If the approach of Indian scholars to their political heritage is characterized by exaggeration and sensitivity and reaction against Western ideas, that of American students of political thought and governance, with a few happy exceptions, is still limited by ignorance and indifference. The former must, therefore, give more attention to objective scholarship and less to nationalistic assertiveness, and the latter must go to school, in order that they may apply to Indian studies the techniques of research and analysis which they have developed to a high degree in other fields of inquiry. As long as they regard the thought of the Orient as mysterious and incomprehensible, as hopelessly enmeshed in a vast body of philosophy and mysticism, they will not be able to understand the mainsprings of Oriental conduct. Neither as members of the privileged minority of mankind nor as students of political thought and action can they any longer afford to neglect the political heritage of Asia, and particularly of India.

Obviously there are special difficulties in the way of a systematic study of Indian political thought, especially that of the ancient period. It has been only within the past century that Sanskritists and other specialists have made available satisfactory translations of the classics of ancient India. Written records appeared relatively late in India, and very little of the vast body of ancient literature has been preserved in any form. The translations of the classics are frequently based on manuscripts which date from the medieval period; to believe that these manuscripts are faithful transcripts of the original classics of centuries before would be too much of a strain on one's credulity. Some of the distortions must have been an unavoidable consequence of many transcriptions and interpretations; others may have been the result of malice aforethought. "The great difficulty in writing a history of political or philosophical thought in ancient India," states Samaren Ray, "lies in getting a correct picture of the facts divorced from myths, legends, and Brahmanic interpolations." Ray is one of those who hold that only the Brahmanical side of the philosophical and political bases of ancient India has been adequately presented. "Since the triumph of the Brahmanic reaction from the time of Samudragupta's reign" (4th century A.D.), he asserts, "a wilful and persistent effort to wipe out or distort anti-Brahmanic and critical ideas has been taking place in India. The rational and critical outlook of the earlier thinkers were [*sic*] completely submerged in this Brahmanic reaction which ushered in the Pauranic age—the dark age of medieval India."[11]

---

[10] K. P. Mukerji, *The State* (Madras, 1952), pp. ix, xi, xvii, 239, 267.

Most of the significant studies of Indian political thought—which are still few and inadequate—were written during the last thirty or forty years. K. P. Jayaswal published two essays on Hindu polity in the *Modern Review* (Calcutta) as early as 1914, but his book on this subject did not appear until 1924. The significant writings of Narendra Nath Law were published between 1914 and 1920. The pioneer works of U. N. Ghoshal, Beni Prasad, and Benoy Kumar Sarkar appeared in the 1920's.[12]

II

Indian political thought, like Hindu civilization, has many distinctive features, but it has been strongly infiltrated with foreign influences, beginning with that of the early invaders, including the Aryans. Since the eleventh century, at least, Mohammedan influences have been felt, especially when Mogul rule extended over a large part of the subcontinent. The British impact upon thought and education was clearly great. This impact, while intimate, was a forced one, and inevitably aroused hostility and defiance; but it also created a kind of "Hindu-British (or European) synthesis," which Percival Spear calls "the working creed of modern India."[13] British influence is still strong in independent India, as even the most casual visitor can attest. For every Indian political thinker today who derives his inspiration from the thought of ancient India, there are probably a dozen who know more about Western than Indian thought and who are more at home when discussing the ideas of Harold J. Laski than when interpreting the *Śāntiparvan* or the *Manusamhitā*. Since Lord Macaulay's famous Minute of 1835, the English pattern of education has been the prevalent system in India. "It is possible," argued Macaulay, "to make natives of this country thoroughly good English scholars and to this end our efforts might be directed." Seldom have efforts been more successful. Most of the leaders of Indian thought and politics in the past century or more, including those who have been most anti-British and those who have preached the necessity of going back to the Vedas and of following Vedānta, have been under strong Western influence, and many have studied abroad.

---

[11] Samaren Ray, "Indian Political Thought from Manu to Gandhi," *The Radical Humanist*, Vol. 18, pp. 332, 336 (July 11, 1954). Ray points out that even the greatest of Hindu classics, the *Mahābhārata*, "represents the Brahmanic side of the great controversy in ancient India between the Brahmins who wanted to maintain their supremacy on the authority of the Vedas and those who challenged the absolute authority of the Vedas and tried to build up a rational outlook and society on human values and realism." Professor D. Mackenzie Brown has reminded me that Ray's interpretation reflects a Positivist point of view, and that many students of Indian philosophy would disagree with this interpretation.

[12] K. P. Jayaswal, *Hindu Polity* (Calcutta, 1924); Narendra Nath Law, *Studies in Ancient Hindu Polity* (London, 1914), *Inter-State Relations in Ancient India* (Calcutta, 1920), *Aspects of Ancient Indian Polity* (Oxford, 1921); U. N. Ghoshal, *A History of Hindu Political Theories* (Calcutta, 1923); Beni Prasad, *The State in Ancient India* (Allahabad, 1928); Benoy Kumar Sarkar, *The Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus* (Leipzig, 1922). Sarkar published two significant articles on Indian political thought in American journals in 1918: "Democratic Ideals and Republican Institutions in India," this REVIEW, Vol. 12, pp. 581–606 (Nov., 1918), and "Hindu Political Philosophy," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 33, pp. 482–500 (Dec., 1918). To the best of my knowledge the former article is the only one dealing with the subject of Indian political thought which has been published in this REVIEW.

[13] Percival Spear, *India, Pakistan, and the West* (London, 1952), p. 204.

Ram Mohan Roy, the "father of the Hindu Reformation," did not hesitate to "borrow from the West with a boldness and an assurance which went far beyond his own puzzled generation."[14] The Brāhmo Samāj, which he founded for the reinterpretation of Hinduism, was, as K. M. Panikkar has pointed out, "a synthesis of the doctrines of the European Enlightenment, with the philosophical views of the *Upanishads*. As a religion Brahmo Samāj was based firmly on the Vedānta, but its outlook on life was European, and derived its inspiration from the intellectual movements of the eighteenth century." Some of the most powerful exponents of a return to the traditions and teachings of ancient India, such as Vivekananda and Aurobindo, were strongly influenced by Western ideas and contacts. The Hindu revival in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, as Panikkar has noted, coincided with "the first large scale meeting of Asian and Western minds."[15] The many new interpretations of Hinduism and Buddhism reflect the influence of Western ideas. The Indian Constitution of 1950 clearly owes far more to Western constitutionalism than to Hindu concepts of government.

Gandhi himself, according to F. S. C. Northrop, represented the non-Aryan aspects of Hindu thought; he reacted against Western ideas and techniques and warned his fellow-countrymen of the insidious effect upon the mind and soul of India of a slavish imitation of Western ways. Yet he was not only Western-educated, but also Western-oriented in many ways.[16] He often acknowledged that a wide reading in Western literature had influenced his thinking, and he even once stated that his basic doctrines owed as much to the teachings of Christ as to the classics of ancient India. The Western stamp on the mind of Jawaharlal Nehru is manifest. He himself once confessed: "I have become a queer mixture of East and West, out of place everywhere, at home nowhere."[17] The conflict in the mind and heart of Nehru typifies the inner struggle which is going on in India today.

Nor should the Muslim influence be overlooked. Mohammedanism, as Toynbee has emphasized, was a product of the Semitic culture which also gave rise to Judaism and Christianity and which formed a major background for what we call Western civilization. It was a proselytizing religion, like Christianity but unlike Hinduism, and Muslim culture was vastly different from Hindu civilization. Over the centuries a large measure of intermingling and fusion occurred between Muslims and Hindus, but the basic chasm remained and brought forth evil fruit in the twentieth century. The writings of Syed Ahmad Khan[18] in the nineteenth century and Mohammad Iqbal in the twentieth represented the best of modern Muslim literature and thought; but they also contained the germs of the two-nation theory and the philosophical basis of partition. The importance of Iqbal, one of the leading poets and philosophers of modern India, is just beginning to be appreciated by Western scholars.[19]

---

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 188.

[15] K. M. Panikkar, *Asia and Western Dominance. A Survey of the Vasco Da Gama Epoch of Asian History, 1498–1945* (London, 1953), pp. 317, 489.

[16] F. S. C. Northrop, *The Meeting of East and West* (New York, 1949), p. 415; see also Toynbee, *The World and the West*, p. 80.

[17] *Toward Freedom: the Autobiography of Jawaharlal Nehru* (New York, 1941), p. 353.

Contemporary Indian political thought, therefore, stems from many sources, Eastern and Western, ancient and modern. A question posed by F. S. C. Northrop is timely and pertinent: "Need one wonder, with all these Hindu, Mohammedan, Jainist, Marxist, Lockean, Elizabethan, and Mercantile ideas of the good for man and the state, contradicting each other at many points, and pushing and pulling her in opposite directions, both from within and from without, that staid, intuitive, receptive, indeterminate Mother India finds it difficult to make up her contemporary mind?"[20] Indeed, Indian political thought is probably as diverse as that of the West. In view of the antiquity and the richness of Indian civilization, this should occasion no surprise; as Toynbee reminds us, "India is a whole world in herself; she is a society of the same magnitude as our Western society."[21]

III

Undoubtedly the most distinctive and in all probability the most significant part of Indian political thought is the political thought of ancient India, chiefly Hindu polity. In studying this vast treasure of ancient thought we are handicapped both by lack of knowledge and to some extent by lack of sources. Furthermore, it is often hard to tell what is Hindu in modern Indian thought and what is Muslim or Western. Even more difficult is the problem of isolating political concepts from the main body of Hindu philosophy and from the all-pervasive influence of spiritual and religious teachings and beliefs. Today India is a secular state, but the Hindu view of life dominates thought and action, and that view is fundamentally a religious one. "Religion," declared Radhakrishnan, "has been the master passion of the Hindu mind, a lamp unto its feet and a light unto its path, the presupposition and basis of its civilization, the driving force of its culture, and the expression . . . of its life in God."[22]

---

[18] "Syed was cautious and never looked beyond self-government under British protection. He never ceased to cooperate with the British. . . . But he was clear that there was a Muslim national consciousness quite different from the Hindu. . . . In his whole attitude was implicit the concept of Pakistan." Spear, *India, Pakistan, and the West,* pp. 190–91. See also G. F. I. Graham, *Life and Work of Syed Ahmad Khan* (London, 1888).

[19] See Iqbal Singh, *The Ardent Pilgrim: An Introduction to the Life and Work of Mohammad Iqbal* (London, 1951). The author questions the validity of the close identification of Iqbal with the idea of Pakistan: "Though it is now customary and conventional to refer to Iqbal as the Philosopher and Poet of Pakistan, the Pakistan idea in its materialisation represents the absolute refutation of the very basis of Iqbal's political philosophy" (p. 162). Yet he admits: "Cumulatively, Iqbal by his poetry, by his political and philosophical writings, succeeded in creating an ambient and infectious mood of irrational, revivalistic fervor in which the Pakistan idea could grow and come to its fruition" (p. 156).

[20] Northrop, *The Meeting of East and West,* pp. 416–17.

[21] Toynbee, *The World and the West,* p. 34.

With few exceptions, political ideas in the classics of ancient India are buried in a sea of philosophy and fable, and can hardly be analyzed or understood apart from their larger framework. That framework is the Hindu view of life, which has been described as a synthesis of the fourfold objects of life—*dharma, artha, kāma,* and *mokṣa*—the fourfold order of society *(varna)* or the caste system, and the fourfold succession of the stages of life, culminating in "the free supersocial man." "By means of this threefold discipline," explains Radhakrishnan, "the Hindu strives to reach his destiny, which is to change body into soul, to discover the world's potentiality for virtue, and derive happiness from it."[23]

These basic concepts of Hindu philosophy have a marked relevance to Hindu political thought and give it a character which is seldom found in Western political thinking. *Dharma*—a word for which there is no exact English counterpart—is probably the central concept of Hindu political thought, but it clearly has a significance far beyond the realm of polity.[24] "Dharma," states Radhakrishnan, "gives coherence and direction to the different activities of life. It is not a religious creed or cult imposing an ethical or social rule. It is the complete rule of life, the harmony of the whole man who finds a right and just law of his living."[25] The scholar-philosopher who is now Vice-President of the Republic of India has called the Aśoka wheel in the center of the national flag the wheel of the Law of Dharma, thus symbolizing the continuity between the old and the new. Another basic concept is that of the *saptānga,* or the "seven limbs" of the state: *svāmin* or sovereign, *amātya* or minister, *janapada* or *rāśtra* referring to territory with people, *durga* or fortress, *kośa* or treasury, *daṇḍa* or *bala* meaning sceptre or army, and *mitra* or friends or allies. This doctrine of *saptānga,* in the opinion of Benoy Kumar Sarkar, "constitutes the basis of all political speculation among the Hindu philosophers."[26]

---

[22] Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, *Eastern Religions and Western Thought,* 2nd ed. (London, 1940), p. 20.

[23] *Ibid.,* p. 351.

[24] See especially Mukerji, *The State,* Appendix I, "The Hindu Conception of Dharma." *Dharma* is clearly a concept which is hard to define. It bulks large in the philosophies of India, and it has been described in many different ways. A passage in a Brāhmaṇa refers to *dharma* as those "principles of justice whereby the weak maintain themselves against the strong with the help of the king." Quoted in N. C. Bandyopadhaya, *Development of Hindu Polity and Political Theories* (Calcutta, 1927), p. 273. Most Indian commentators insist that *dharma* has a practical as well as a philosophical significance. Thus Sri Aurobindo wrote: "This subjection of the sovereign power to the Dharma was not an ideal theory inoperative in practice: for the rule of the socio-religious law actively conditioned the whole life of the people and was therefore a living reality and it had in the political field very large practical consequences." *The Spirit and Form of Indian Polity* (Calcutta, 1947), p. 13.

[25] Radhakrishnan, *Eastern Religions and Western Thought,* p. 353.

[26] Sarkar, *The Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus,* p. 167.

Much of ancient Indian political thought is found in the Vedas, the Brāhmaṇas, the Dharmaśāstras, and the Dharmasūtras, in the Arthaśāstra and Nītiśāstra literature, notably Kautilya's *Arthaśāstra* and the *Manusaṃhitā*, in some of the early Buddhist and Jainist writings, and in the *Rāmāyana* and the *Mahābhārata*. The Arthaśāstra and Nītiśāstra literature, and the *Śāntiparvan* of the *Mahābhārata*, provide material which can clearly be labeled political thought as distinct from philosophy in general.[27] They also contain, as has often been noted, some of the most coldblooded realism in political literature.

Ancient Hindu thought deals with many subjects which have bulked large in the political theory of the Western world. Among these are the nature and origin of the state, types of states, the relation of state and society, the forms of government, the origin of kingship, the duties of kings, royal authority and its limitations, power politics, diplomacy, and administration. Perhaps we should also include theories of the state of nature, the social contract, and sovereignty, possibly even international law. Conflicting theories of international relations can be found in ancient India as well as in the modern world. The doctrine of *maṇḍala* or circle of states was a kind of Hindu theory of the balance of power, and the doctrine of *sārvabhauma* suggests modern theories of world federation or a world state.[28]

All this has a very familiar ring. It is indeed tempting to draw comparisons between ancient Indian and Western political thought, as many Indian and foreign political scientists have done. "The essential nature of the Hindu State," asserts Professor K. P. Mukerji, "was almost the same as that of the modern State."[29] The concept of *rājadharma* has been viewed as similar to the Greek ideas of the functions of the state. Kautilya has been called the Indian Machiavelli. Hindu political thinkers had a conception of the universal wickedness of mankind, as did the Fathers of the Christian Church. They described the state as a social agency which was brought into existence because the life of man in the state of nature was becoming increasingly intolerable, and the same idea appears in Hobbes. "Hobbes' theory of a state of nature," declared N. C. Bandyopadhaya, "is almost the same as we find in the 67th chapter of the Sāntiparva."[30] Locke's "dictates of right reason" have been described as "practically the same as the Dharma of the Indian theory."[31] *Dharma* has also been compared with the "external law" of Thomas Aquinas. The idea of the struggle for existence was repeatedly expressed in the doctrine of *matsya-nyāya*, or "the logic of the fish." The authors of ancient Hindu classics wrote voluminously on the divine origin of kings; they would have understood and appreciated the claims of James I. Benoy Kumar Sarkar believed that the principle of *daṇḍa* as described by Manu was equivalent to the *majestas* of Bodin and the *summa*

---

[27] See especially A. S. Altekar, *State and Government in Ancient India* (Benares, 1949), pp. 1–3.

[28] Sarkar, *The Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus*, pp. 214–26.

[29] Mukerji, *The State*, p. 350.

[30] Bandyopadhaya, *Development of Hindu Polity and Political Theories*, p. 323.

[31] D. R. Bhandarkar, *Some Aspects of Ancient Hindu Polity* (Benares, 1929), p. 150.

potestas of Grotius, an interpretation which was accepted without question by Professor Gettell.[32]

Examples of this sort could be multiplied indefinitely. They are suggestive and challenging, and they give an aura of timelessness to ancient doctrines. But comparisons between different civilizations and different historical periods are dangerous at best, and in the case of ancient Hindu and Western political thought the temptation to make facile but misleading comparisons is particularly irresistible. "Nowhere in the Mahābhārata, Purāna or Arthaśāstra," states Bhandarkar, "has been found any Hindu theory which is exactly co-extensive with that of the West in all respects . . . the Hindu mind worked in different environments and in a different direction."[33] There is, I suggest, a vast difference between the Hindu theories of the origin of kingship and of *rāja-dharma*, as found in the *Śāntiparvan*, the *Manusaṃhitā*, and in Kautilya, and divine-right-of-kings theories of seventeenth-century Europe. In ancient India royal authority was not of an absolute nature; there were definite checks on kingship, which was regarded as a trust rather than as a limitless prerogative. Many rulers undoubtedly abused their trust and violated the eternal *dharma*, but they did not thereby establish the principle of divine right. The epics cite several instances of tyrants who were killed by their indignant subjects.[34]

The Hindu state was very different in nature and in purpose from both the Greek and the modern state. Indeed, there is some doubt whether the word *rājya* should be translated as "state."[35] This illustrates the semantic problem of finding precise and meaningful English equivalents for the terminology of ancient Indian political literature. One basic difference between the Hindu state and the Greek state was that whereas to the Greeks the state was "the *terminus ad quem* of man's whole development," as Ernest Barker has stated, to the Hindus it was only a preparatory stage for the attainment of the great goals of life—namely *mokṣa* or *nirvāna*.[36] There is little in common between the shadowy concepts of sovereignty of the ancient Hindus and the positive formulations of Bodin and Grotius; to expect to find in the former a parallel to the precise and coherent political thought of the latter is clearly to expect the impossible."[37] Yet Mukerji boasts of "the superb modernism of Hindu political theory," in contrast to "the jumbled primitiveness of Filmer, Bodin or Hobbes."[38]

---

[32] Sarkar, *The Political Institutions and Theories of the Hindus*, p. 201; Gettell, *History of Political Thought*, p. 26.

[33] Bhandarkar, *Some Aspects of Ancient Hindu Polity*, p. 134.

[34] See *Kautilya's Arthaśāstra*, trans. by Dr. R. Shamasastry, 4th ed. (Mysore, 1951), Book 1, ch. 19, "The Duties of a King"; also Altekar, *State and Government in Ancient India*, p. 17, and Indira Nalin, "The Head of the State in Ancient India," unpublished paper prepared for the South Asia Seminar at the University of Pennsylvania, 1953. For the Western divine right theory of kingship, see J. N. Figgis, *The Theory of the Divine Right of Kings*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, Eng., 1914).

[35] Bandyopadhaya, *Development of Hindu Polity and Political Theories*, p. vii.

[36] S. P. Singh has suggested the insertion of the following statement after this sentence: "But *nirvana* or *mokṣa* cannot be attained without duty. Duty becomes a part of the political and social life of the modern age." Letter to the author, dated Sept. 23, 1954.

[37] See Ghoshal, *A History of Hindu Political Theories*.

We should be wary of claiming too much for the political thought of ancient India. Many contemporary students of the subject still question its significance, or even its identifiability as theory. "Nowhere . . . in the vast mass of Sanskrit literature," states N. G. D. Joardar, "have I come across a formal treatise on politics satisfying the enquiries of a modern mind. Very little exists in the way of political theory or philosophy. India took certain forms of government for granted and discussed only the duties and responsibilities of different castes." In his opinion, very little that could be called political thought can be found in the Vedas and the Brāhmaṇas. A study of the Dharmaśāstras, too, "is arid from the standpoint of political theory." The Arthaśāstras "were mostly administrative manuals, not primarily discussions of political theories." Only five of the fifteen books of Kautilya's *Arthaśāstra* contain "some sort of political thinking." In the *Śāntiparvan* of the *Mahābhārata* "there is a long and profitable discussion of the subject." But "even here the duties of people are described; their rights and political claims are left out."[39] Joardar's observations are very pertinent. The search for political ideas in the vast literature of ancient India—including Sanskrit and non-Sanskrit writings—is one of the needle-in-the-haystack variety; but the patient and trained investigator can find much more than Joardar suggests. The absence of a systematic approach to political philosophy and the limited framework within which political ideas were expressed are not in themselves evidences of a lack of substance or of perception. Many of the greatest contributions to political theory are unsystematic and biased. Joardar's caveats, however, are a useful antidote to excessive claims by other Indian scholars. When better known and understood, ancient Indian polity will have a significant place in the history of political ideas; but we do not have to turn to it as the fount of all political wisdom.

Undoubtedly ancient Hindu polity has many distinctive aspects. Aside from its intimate and subordinate relation to the whole body of political philosophy, the broad significance of its basic concepts, such as *dharma* and *daṇḍa* and *artha* and *nīti*, and its emphasis on *rājadharma*, it had much to say about special problems such as the relation between taxation and protection and the mutual relations of Brahmans and Kṣatriyas within the general *varṇāśramic* order of society. Professor Mukerji holds that ancient Hindu political thought avoided the legalistic and nationalistic approach to the problems of the state by "(1) relating legal and State-al theory to a social and political theory and then (2) by integrating the socio-political theory with a morally valid philosophy or view of life." He believes that modern Western political theorists are beginning to adopt the first approach but with a few exceptions have not yet appreciated the necessity of the second.[40]

Ancient Hindu writers on the science of polity had an exalted opinion of the origin and importance of their subject, and while many of their discussions centered around one great theme—*rājadharma* or the duties of kings—they believed, to use the words of the *Śāntiparvan*, that "in Politics are centered all the Worlds." "The science of kingly duties," averred Yudhishthira in Chapter 56 of the *Śāntiparvan*, "is the refuge of the whole world of life." Kautilya defined *arthaśāstra*, or the science of polity, as "that science which treats of the means of acquiring and maintaining the earth." Modern political scientists may derive inspiration and breadth of viewpoint from these ancient Hindu commentaries. They may also be inspired by the wonderful account in Chapter 59 of the *Śāntiparvan* of the divine origin of their discipline, although they may prefer a more mundane explanation.

---

[38] Mukerji, *The State*, p. 352.

[39] N. G. D. Joardar, "The Study of Indian Polity," unpublished paper prepared in connection with the program at which this paper was first presented.

[40] Mukerji, *The State*, p. 363.

The great classics of Hindu political thought were written many centuries ago. Kautilya's *Arthaśāstra* is usually ascribed to the 4th century B.C., although some scholars insist that it was written seven or eight centuries later. This is a still unsettled controversy into which we do not need to enter. The *Śāntiparvan* and the Laws of Manu were probably written between 200 B.C. and 200 A.D. Only a few works of a later period, such as Kamandaka's *Nītiśāra* and the *Śukranīti*, are at all comparable in importance.

IV

Hindu political thought never again approached the mountain peaks of the classical period. It was largely submerged during the long centuries of foreign invasions and rule. During the Hindu revival of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries political ideas again became important, but the source of these ideas was often difficult to trace. Even in the classical period Hindu political thought was obviously not a coherent whole. It is difficult to distinguish the Aryan from the non-Aryan elements. The ancient works which may be most properly described as political in nature, notably Kautilya's *Arthaśāstra*, the *Manusaṃhitā*, and the *Śāntiparvan*, seemed to pay little attention to morals or to socio-political theory, which are regarded by Professor Mukerji as basic to Hindu political thought.

The relation of this body of political thought to that of modern India also raises many questions. After centuries of decline, foreign invasions, Mogul and then British rule, was the continuity of Hindu political thought and the Hindu tradition as marked as both Indian and Western scholars seem to believe? Another fundamental question concerns the nature of the Hindu state and the Hindu political tradition or traditions down through the centuries. Is that tradition essentially authoritarian, with some local and temporary democratic aspects; or is it essentially democratic, with much local and personal freedom and definite and effective checks upon rulers who tried to abuse their high office? Professor Mukerji insists that "the Indian political theory has always been democratic or morally oriented or *dharmic*."[41] Is this really true? What is the *dharmic* concept of democracy? One might also ask what Professor Mukerji's concept of democracy is, since elsewhere in his important book he states that "communism is the most genuine . . . form of democracy."[42]

---

[41] *Ibid.*, pp. 340–41.

In contemporary India, political science is still an underdeveloped subject. The oldest department of political science, at Lucknow University, is only about thirty years old. Indian political scientists are still largely influenced by Western training and thinking, and as yet they have produced few significant studies of the unique features of their own political heritage. Professor S. V. Kogekar speaks of "the almost unconscious imposition of the British Parliamentary pattern of government on the minds of Indian thinkers." He believes that "the general tendency is to adopt all too uncritically the values and criteria derived from Western, and particularly British, experience and to seek to apply them to Indian conditions."[43] "Indian scholars have themselves been the first to admit," states Dr. A. Appadorai, "that contributions of Indian scholarship to fundamental thinking in Political Science have been somewhat disappointing; they have hardly enriched the analysis of political ideas or institutions with conclusions drawn from Indian experience."[44] Only a few Indian political scientists are acknowledged authorities on ancient Indian political thought.

The great political thinkers of modern India have been men of thought and action like Ram Mohan Roy, Syed Ahmad Khan, Vivekananda, Aurobindo, Tagore, Iqbal, Gandhi, Mohammed Ali Jinnah, and Nehru. The philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi, as Albert Schweitzer has observed, "is a world in itself."[45] Gandhi never tried to evolve a consistent political philosophy; his writings, statements, and actions are full of contradictions and inconsistencies. It is difficult to trace the origins of his teachings; he took his ideas from many sources, and adapted them in the light of his own experiences and observations to the needs of his country as he envisioned these needs. His political ideas were "an organic part of his philosophy of life," which was essentially religious in character. To him "there are no politics devoid of religion." "Better than anybody else" he "appreciated the supreme role of moral persuasion in social and political changes." He preached the "superiority of one's conscience over any mighty power in the world."[46] His analysis of the relations between ends and means[47] and his philosophical justification and explanation of *ahimsā* and *satyāgraha*[48] deserve the careful attention of students of political thought. His followers are still divided in their interpretation of the exact nature of the *rāmrājya* of which he constantly spoke. Certainly free India today is a pale reflection of this ideal.[49]

---

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 192.

[43] S. V. Kogekar, "Present Status of Political Science Studies in India," in S. V. Kogekar and A. Appadorai, *Political Science in India* (Delhi, 1953), p. 6. This is a reprint of an article which originally appeared in the *International Social Science Bulletin,* Vol. 4, pp. 124–29 (Spring, 1952).

[44] A. Appadorai, "Progress of Political Science in India," in Kogekar and Appadorai, *Political Science in India,* p. 15. This is a reprint of a paper which was originally published in *Contemporary Political Science* (UNESCO, 1950).

[45] Albert Schweitzer, *Indian Thought and Its Development* (New York, 1936), p. 228.

[46] M. P. Mangudkar, "Gandhi's Contribution to Modern Political Thought," *The Radical Humanist,* Vol. 17, pp. 545, 548, 575–76 (Nov. 15 and 29, 1953).

[47] The concept of the relation between ends and means is deep-rooted in the Hindu political and religious tradition. Gandhi did his best to elevate it to a practical principle of statecraft, while at the same time he emphasized its deeper meaning. Madame Pandit has given a striking illustration of the Mahatma's faith in this concept. Her last interview with Gandhi occurred about a month before his assassination, while she was preparing to return to Moscow for the last two months of her service as Indian Ambassador to the

V

"The contemporary Orient," states Northrop, "is the product of its traditional self and the influence of the West."[50] India is an outstanding illustration of this fusion of influences and ideas. Perhaps this should be expected of a land where the Western impact was the most intimate and where a continuous civili-

---

Soviet Union and shortly before she was scheduled to go to the United States as Indian Ambassador. Since she visited Gandhi on a Monday, which was his day of silence, the Mahatma communicated his thoughts to her in writing. The message which he asked her to convey to the governments and peoples of Russia and America was as follows: "What India is trying to say to the world is a constant challenge to our power of interpretation and can be repeated to both Moscow and Washington. It is the essence of our creed and fundamental to an understanding of our way of life as well as our political stand. You know what I think—the end in itself is not important—unless the means we follow to achieve it are right. The countries of the Western world would do well to try to understand this. It is what you must explain to the people of America. Until the implications of this are clear to them, there will be no appreciation either now or in the days ahead of the stand our country will take on important issues." Madame Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, "India to America: The Position of India in World Politics," in "Perspective of India," Supplement to the *Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 192, pp. 107–09 (Oct., 1953).

[48] N. G. D. Joardar has offered the following trenchant observations regarding the doctrines of *ahimsā* and *satyāgraha:* "The eagerness to stand for truth in all aspects of life, which is the essence of satya-graha, and to carry out the program without any kind of violence in thought and speech, far less in action, which forms the kernel of ahimsa are excellent principles, worthy of admiration. But they are essentially the privilege of the spiritual elite. The man in the street has neither the insight nor the courage to follow the doctrines. They charm him, however, and he blindly follows the lead of somebody who sets himself up as the apostle of the twin principles. I believe that satya-graha and ahimsa are as aristocratic as the position of the Brahmins in the caste system. In bringing the mountain-tops of the spiritual world to the sordid affairs of politics, Mahatma purified it to some extent but I do believe that its practice does not coincide with the voting role of the majority rule which is the basis of democracy." These views would undoubtedly be challenged by many interpreters of Indian ways of thought and action; but certainly Gandhi's views on *ahimsā* and *satyāgraha* were of an exalted nature which few lesser persons could even comprehend in their full dimensions, much less accept and implement. One may also suggest that in Gandhi's mind the two concepts were refined and clarified, and given a scope and an application which were without parallel in Indian history. Possibly, also, Gandhi's interpretations differed rather fundamentally from the traditional approach. Albert Schweitzer has expressed this opinion: "In Gandhi's ethical life Ahimsā becomes a different thing from what it was in the thought of ancient India. . . . The ancient Indian Ahimsā is an expression of world and life negation. . . . But Gandhi places Ahimsā at the service of world and life affirmation directed to activity in the world." *Indian Thought and Its Development*, pp. 227, 231.

[49] In January, 1953 about a dozen of the world's leading thinkers came to New Delhi, at the invitation of the Government of India, to participate in a "Seminar on the Contributions of the Gandhian Outlook and Techniques to the Solution of Tensions between and within Nations." It was a well-deserved tribute to the greatest of modern Indians, whose thoughts and message extended far beyond the borders of his own country.

[50] Northrop, *The Meeting of East and West*, p. 405.

zation of high level has flourished longer than any other in the world, with the possible exception of China. Western political thought is an important ingredient of contemporary Indian political thought, and therefore the problem of coalescence or clash, it might seem, is already being worked out in the Indian arena. But it may be that the Western component has contributed to the inner struggle that is going on in India today, to what Nehru has called the "torment in our minds." Neither Western nor Indian political thought presents a coherent pattern; there are conflicting elements in each; and at the present time each is clearly in a state of transition and of consequent tension. There is no reason, however, why the political thought of the Western world should not continue to influence that of the Asian civilizations, including India, without major philosophical or ideological clashes. Moreover, from India may come influences which will widen the horizons of Western political thinkers and which will give political ideas a sounder foundation in philosophical and metaphysical speculation.

The concepts of the essential unity of mankind and of the philosophical ties which bind East and West have never been more profoundly held or more eloquently voiced than by the seminal thinkers of modern India. These concepts bulked large in the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi and Rabindranath Tagore. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan has frequently voiced the same beliefs. In his great work, *Eastern Religions and Western Thought,* he wrote:

> Whether we like it or not, East and West have come together and can no more part. The spatial nearness is preparing the way for a spiritual approximation and interchange of treasures of mind and imagination. If we are nurtured exclusively on the past of Europe or of Asia we cannot consider ourselves to be cultivated. The thought and experience of one-half of humanity cannot be neglected without peril. If we are to correct the narrowness resulting from a one-sided and exclusive preoccupation with either Eastern or Western thought, if we are to fortify our inner life with the dignity of a more perfect and universal experience, an understanding of each other's cultures is essential.[51]

To the extent that the conflict between the so-called East and West is an ideological one, it is a conflict which stems from ideological fissures in the Western world, for liberal democracy and communism are both products of Western civilization. Moreover, the borders between the Communist and the non-Communist world are not the Suez Canal, the Turkish Straits, and the Caucasus and Ural Mountains. Freedom is not a Western monopoly, nor is despotism a peculiar offshoot of Oriental societies. The increasingly close contacts between Asia and the West come at a troubled period in the world's history, and revolutionary upheavals and frequent clashes can safely be predicted. But the conflicts need not be basically on the level of political thought and ideology. In the political tradition of the Western world and also in that of India one can find the roots of the ideas and practices which underlie the present age of *realpolitik,* national instability, and incipient international anarchy; but in the same traditions one may find ideas and examples which will give guidance and inspiration for man's endless adventure,

straining for ever to the light
that flows from regions out of sight.

---

[51] Radhakrishnan, *Eastern Religions and Western Thought,* p. 115.

JUDICIAL SELF-RESTRAINT

JOHN P. ROCHE
Haverford College

Every society, sociological research suggests, has its set of myths which incorporate and symbolize its political, economic, and social aspirations. Thus, as medieval society had the Quest for the Holy Grail and the cult of numerology, we, in our enlightened epoch, have as significant manifestations of our collective hopes the dream of impartial decision-making and the cult of "behavioral science." While in my view these latter two are but different facets of the same fundamental drive, namely, the age-old effort to exorcise human variables from human action, our concern here is with the first of them, the pervasive tendency in the American political and constitutional tradition directed towards taking the politics out of politics, and substituting some set of Platonic guardians for fallible politicians.

While this dream of objectivizing political Truth is in no sense a unique American phenomenon, it is surely true to say that in no other democratic nation has the effort been carried so far and with such persistence.[1] Everywhere one turns in the United States, he finds institutionalized attempts to narrow the political sector and to substitute allegedly "independent" and "impartial" bodies for elected decision-makers.[2] The so-called "independent regulatory commissions" are a classic example of this tendency in the area of administration, but unquestionably the greatest hopes for injecting pure Truth-serum into the body politic have been traditionally reserved for the federal judiciary, and particularly for the Supreme Court. The rationale for this viewpoint is simple: "The people must be protected from themselves, and no institution is better fitted for the role of chaperone than the federal judiciary, dedicated as it is to the supremacy of the rule of law."

Patently central to this function of social chaperonage is the right of the judiciary to review legislative and executive actions and nullify those measures which derogate from eternal principles of truth and justice as incarnated in the Constitution. Some authorities, enraged at what the Supreme Court has found the Constitution to mean, have essayed to demonstrate that the Framers did not intend the Court to exercise this function, to have, as they put it, "the last word."[3] I find no merit in this contention; indeed, it seems to me undeniable not only that the authors of the Constitution intended to create a federal government, but also that they assumed *sub silentio* that the Supreme Court would have the power to review both national and state legislation.[4]

---

[1] See Kenneth C. Wheare, *Federal Government,* 3rd ed. (New York, 1953), pp. 60–68 for a discussion of the application of judicial review in other nations. The British formerly utilized "impartial" bodies extensively in administration, but in recent years there has been a trend towards subsuming all administrative agencies under the direction of politically responsible ministers; see William A. Robson, "The Public Corporation in Britain Today," *Harvard Law Review,* Vol. 63, pp. 1321–48 (June, 1950). The French, in their postwar nationalization acts, tried to excise politics from the operation of the state industries by establishing functional boards composed on the basis of interest representation; see Mario Einaudi, "Nationalization in France and Italy," *Social Research,* Vol. 15, pp. 22–43 (March, 1948), but apparently Truth was as elusive as ever; see Adolf Sturmthal, "The Structure of Nationalized Industries in France," *Political Science Quarterly,* Vol. 67, pp. 357–77 (Sept., 1952). The failure of a classic effort to take economics out of politics was chronicled by Lindsay Rogers and W. R. Dittmar, "The Reichswirtschaftsrat: *De Mortuis,*" *Political Science Quarterly,* Vol. 50, pp. 481–501 (Dec., 1935).

[2] See Avery Leiserson, *Administrative Regulation, A Study in Representation of Interests* (Chicago, 1942); E. Pendleton Herring, *Public Administration and the Public Interest* (New York, 1936); John P. Roche and Murray S. Stedman, Jr., *The Dynamics of Democratic Government* (New York, 1954), Ch. 12.

However, since the intention of the Framers is essentially irrelevant except to antiquarians and polemicists, it is unnecessary to examine further the matter of origins. The fact is that the United States Supreme Court, and the inferior federal courts under the oversight of the high Court, have enormous policy-making functions. Unlike their British and French counterparts, federal judges are not merely technicians who live in the shadow of a supreme legislature, but are fully equipped to intervene in the process of political decision-making. In theory, they are limited by the Constitution and the jurisdiction it confers, but, in practice, it would be a clumsy judge indeed who could not, by a little skilful exegesis, adapt the Constitution to a necessary end.[5] This statement is in no sense intended as a condemnation; on the contrary, it has been this perpetual reinvigoration by reinterpretation, in which the legislature and the executive as well as the courts play a part, that has given the Constitution its survival power. Applying a Constitution which contains at key points inspired ambiguity, the courts have been able to pour the new wine in the old bottle. Note that the point at issue is not the legitimacy or wisdom of judicial legislation; it is simply the enormous scope that this prerogative gives to judges to substitute their views for those of past generations, or, more controversially, for those of a contemporary Congress and President.

---

[3] The classic statement of this position was Charles G. Haines' *The Role of the Supreme Court in American Government and Politics, 1789–1835* (Berkeley, 1944). William W. Crosskey has recently thrown some semantic fagots on this dying fire, *Politics and the Constitution*, 2 vols. (Chicago, 1953). It might be useful to point out that under the American system of checks and balances the Supreme Court does *not* have the last word. If the Court abuses its prerogatives, as it did in the income tax case, the power to amend the Constitution serves as an antidote. This was particularly true in the formative years of the Republic when the Court's decision in *Chisholm* v. *Georgia*, 2 Dallas 419 (1793), was immediately countered by the Eleventh Amendment; see *Hollingsworth* v. *Virginia*, 3 Dallas 378 (1798), for a discussion of the impact of this amendment on judicial procedure. Today the amending power has become quite difficult to implement (but see the exceptionally rapid passage of the Twenty-second Amendment); however, at a time when senators were chosen by state legislatures it was highly probable that an amendment receiving two-thirds of the votes in the Senate would reflect directly the sentiments of the sovereign states.

[4] See the recent statement by Professors Hart and Wechsler that "the grant of judicial power was to include the power, where necessary in the decision of cases, to disregard state or federal statutes found to be unconstitutional. Despite the curiously persisting myth of usurpation, the Convention's understanding on this point emerges from its records with singular clarity." Henry M. Hart, Jr. and Herbert Wechsler, *The Federal Courts and the Federal System* (Brooklyn, 1953), p. 14.

[5] See the fine study by Benjamin Twiss, *Lawyers and the Constitution* (Princeton, 1942).

Thus it is naive to assert that the Supreme Court is limited by the Constitution, and we must turn elsewhere for the sources of judicial restraint. The great power exercised by the Court has carried with it great risks, so it is not surprising that American political history has been sprinkled with demands that the judiciary be emasculated.[6] The really startling thing is that, with the notable exception of the McCardle incident in 1869,[7] the Supreme Court has emerged intact from each of these encounters. Despite the plenary power that Congress, under Article III of the Constitution, can exercise over the appellate jurisdiction of the high Court, the national legislature has never taken sustained and effective action against its House of Lords.[8] It is beyond the purview of this analysis to examine the reasons for congressional inaction;[9] suffice it here to say that the most significant form of judicial limitation has remained self-limitation. This is not to suggest that such a development as statutory codification has not cut down the area of interpretive discretion, for it obviously has. It is rather to maintain that when the justices have held back from assaults on legislative or executive actions, they have done so on the basis of self-established rationalizations such as Justice Brandeis' famous "Ashwander rules."[10]

---

[6] The first major effort was made by the Jeffersonians when they impeached Justice Samuel Chase for his bitter displays of anti-Jeffersonianism on the bench. Although the attempt failed to gather the necessary two-thirds vote in the Senate required for conviction—and a constitutional amendment which would have made federal judges removable by the President upon joint address by Congress also died aborning—the Supreme Court went into judicious hibernation; see Haines, pp. 264–65. The Dred Scott decision brought from Republicans demands that the Court be curbed, including the famous statement by Lincoln to the effect that while the Court's views were interesting, they were not necessarily binding upon the coördinate branches of government; see Charles Warren, *The Supreme Court in United States History*, 2 vols. (Boston, 1947), Vol. 2, p. 331. In the post-Civil War period, the demand was taken up by the agrarian radicals and later by the Socialists, and the Progressive Platform in the 1912 election contained an endorsement of recall of Supreme Court decisions by referendum. The most recent struggle, that between President Franklin D. Roosevelt and the "Nine Old Men," concerned the right to add personnel to the Court rather than to impeach the content of judicial decisions *qua* decisions. Since the segregation decision of June, 1954, some new precincts have reported: southern statesmen, allegedly pillars of conservatism and the rule of law, have been denouncing what they call the Court's "political decision," and one of the candidates for nomination in the 1954 Democratic gubernatorial primary in Georgia ran on the slogan: "Abolish the Supreme Court!" He lost, but before too much consolation is drawn from this defeat, it should be added that the winner seemingly favored the abolition of the *whole* national government if necessary to prevent desegregation.

[7] *Ex parte McCardle*, 7 Wall. 506 (1869). See Warren, Vol. 2, pp. 473–89, for a discussion of this famous judicial emasculation.

[8] For this expressive phrase, I am indebted to the analysis of Maurice Finkelstein, "Judicial Self-Limitation," *Harvard Law Review*, Vol. 37, pp. 338–64 (Jan., 1924).

[9] See Roche and Stedman, Ch. 10, for a brief attempt to explain why the United States courts have remained so autonomous.

[10] Promulgated by Justice Brandeis in his concurring opinion in *Ashwander* v. *T.V.A.*, 297 U. S. 288, at 345–48 (1936).

The remainder of this paper is therefore concerned with two aspects of this auto-limitation: first, the techniques by which it is put into practice; and, second, the conditions under which it is exercised. It might be noted that no judgment will be entered on the merits of judicial action: the American people, however wisely or foolishly, have incorporated the notion of judicial supremacy in their social myths; I accept that fact as a constant in the equation. Furthermore, there seems to be little question of principle in the long-standing argument over the legitimacy of judicial legislation. On the contrary, it appears that all hands have been in favor of judicial restraint when it operates on their behalf, and in favor of judicial intervention when such action forwards their objectives. From the Jeffersonians, who maintained that the judiciary should declare the Sedition Act of 1798 unconstitutional,[11] to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who kept to himself his view that a section of the Lend-Lease Act was unconstitutional to avoid embarrassing his congressional lieutenants,[12] American politics has demonstrated little abiding concern with "principles of jurisprudence." An analyst may be devoted to such principles, but he should not permit his ideological "aprioris" to dominate his presentation of descriptive data.[13]

TECHNIQUES OF JUDICIAL SELF-RESTRAINT

The major techniques of judicial self-restraint appear to fall under the two familiar rubrics: procedural and substantive. Under the former fall the various techniques by which the Court can avoid coming to grips with substantive issues, while under the latter would fall those methods by which the Court, in a substantive holding, finds that the matter at issue in the litigation is not properly one for judicial settlement. Let us examine these two categories in some detail.

---

[11] Most notably in the trial of Callander for sedition in the Virginia Circuit Court. Haines, pp. 163–65, distinguishes this case on the ground that the Jeffersonian lawyers asked the *jury* to declare the Sedition Act unconstitutional, but fails to point out that they used as precedent two Virginia cases in which *judges* had declared Virginia statutes violative of the state constitution. Tactics in this case, with Samuel Chase on the bench, obviously precluded asking the judge to hold the law null and void; see Francis Wharton, *State Trials of the United States during the Administrations of Washington and Adams* (Philadelphia, 1849), pp. 709 ff. Chase declared the Sedition Act to be constitutional, and further asserted his jurisdiction to make this finding. He made the same assertion in *Cooper* v. *Telfair*, 4 Dallas 14, at 19 (1800). The abolitionists later made a name for themselves by urging the Court to hold the Fugitive Slave Act unconstitutional while simultaneously maintaining that states'-rights forbade judicial enforcement of the statute; see Jacobus tenBroek, *The Antislavery Origins of the Fourteenth Amendment* (Berkeley, 1951), Ch. 2.

[12] Robert H. Jackson, "A Presidential Legal Opinion," *Harvard Law Review*, Vol. 66, pp. 1353–61 (June, 1953), in which the late Justice Jackson recorded F.D.R.'s conviction and privately recorded opinion that the termination-by-concurrent-resolution section of the Lend-Lease Act was unconstitutional. The President refused to make his views public because several isolationist senators had made the same point in attacking the measure, and the administration's leaders in the Senate had gone firmly on record as to its constitutionality.

[13] The purpose of this statement is to make it clear that I am not an advocate of oligarchy or judicial irresponsibility, although I do not take time out in the course of this analysis to engage in missionary activities.

Procedural Self-Restraint. Since the passage of the Judiciary Act of 1925,[14] the Supreme Court has had almost complete control over its business. United States Supreme Court *Rule 38*, which governs the certiorari policy, states (#5) that discretionary review will be granted only "where there are special and important reasons therefor." Professor Fowler Harper has suggested in a series of detailed and persuasive articles on the application of this discretion[15] that the Court has used it in such a fashion as to duck certain significant but controversial problems. While one must be extremely careful about generalizing in this area, since the reasons for denying certiorari are many and complex,[16] Harper's evidence does suggest that the Court in the period since 1949 has refused to review cases involving important civil liberties problems which on their merits appeared to warrant adjudication.[17] As he states at one point: "it is disconcerting when the Court will review a controversy over a patent on a pin ball machine while one man is deprived of his citizenship and another of his liberty without Supreme Court review of a plausible challenge to the validity of government action."[18] That this restraint is not wholly accidental is suggested by Professor Pritchett's recent study of the general attitude of the Vinson Court towards civil liberty issues.[19]

Furthermore, the Supreme Court can issue certiorari on its own terms. Thus in *Dennis* v. *United States*,[20] appealing the Smith Act convictions of the American Communist leadership, the Court accepted the evidential findings of the

---

[14] 43 *Stat.* 936.

[15] Fowler Harper and Alan S. Rosenthal, "What the Supreme Court Did Not Do in the 1949 Term," *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, Vol. 99, pp. 293–325 (Dec., 1950); Harper and Edwin D. Ethrington, "What the Supreme Court Did Not Do in the 1950 Term," *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, Vol. 100, pp. 354–409 (Dec., 1951); Harper and George C. Pratt, "What the Supreme Court Did Not Do during the 1951 Term," *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, Vol. 101, pp. 439–79 (Jan., 1953); and Harper and George Leibowitz, "What the Supreme Court Did Not Do during the 1952 Term," *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, Vol. 103, pp. 427–63 (Feb., 1954).

[16] As Justice Frankfurter pointed out in *Maryland* v. *Baltimore Radio Show*, 338 U. S. 912 (1950).

[17] Among them: *Lapides* v. *Clark*, 176 F.2d 619 (D. C. Cir. 1949) [loss of citizenship]; *cert. denied*, 338 U. S. 861 (1949); *Trumbo* v. *U. S.*, 176 F.2d 49 (D. C. Cir. 1949) [attack on *vires* of House Committee on Un-American Activities]; *cert. denied*, 339 U. S. 434 (1950); *Dorsey* v. *Stuyvesant Town Corp.*, 299 N. Y. 512 (1949) [legality of segregation in housing built with state aid]; *cert. denied*, 339 U. S. 981 (1950); *Mastrapasqua* v. *Shaughnessy*, 186 F.2d 717 (2d Cir. 1950) [judicial review of deportation order]; *cert. denied*, 341 U. S. 930 (1951); *Taylor* v. *Birmingham*, 253 Ala. 369 (1949) [segregation enforced by breach of the peace warrants]; *cert. denied*, 340 U. S. 832 (1950).

[18] *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, Vol. 99, p. 323 (Dec., 1950).

[19] See C. Herman Pritchett, *Civil Liberties and the Vinson Court* (Chicago, 1954).

[20] 341 U. S. 494 (1951). It might be noted here that by refusing to grant certiorari the Court avoided ruling on the Smith Act in 1943; see *Dunne* v. *U. S.*, 138 F.2d 137 (8th Cir. 1943) [conviction of Minneapolis Trotskyites under Smith Act]; *cert. denied*, 320 U. S. 790 (1943); *rehearing denied*, 320 U. S. 814 (1943).

Second Circuit as final and limited its review to two narrow constitutional issues.[21] This, in effect, burked the basic problem: whether the evidence was sufficient to demonstrate that the Communist party, U.S.A., was *in fact* a clear and present danger to the security of the nation, or whether the Communists were merely shouting "Fire!" in an empty theater.

Other related procedural techniques are applicable in some situations. Simple delay can be employed, perhaps in the spirit of the Croatian proverb that "delay is the handmaiden of justice." The case of *Duncan* v. *Kahanamoku,*[22] contesting the validity of military trials of civilians in Hawaii during the war, is a good instance of the judicial stall: Duncan was locked up in August, 1942, and only succeeded in bringing *habeas corpus* action in the District Court in April, 1944. In November, 1944, the Ninth Circuit affirmed the denial of the writ,[23] and Duncan immediately applied to the Supreme Court for certiorari—which was granted in February, 1945. The Supreme Court studied the case carefully while the war ended, and then in February, 1946, determined that Duncan had been improperly convicted. The Japanese-Americans, attempting to get a judicial ruling on the validity of their detainment in relocation centers, met with the same Kafka-esque treatment.[24] However, the technique of procedural self-restraint is founded on the essentially simple gadget of refusing jurisdiction, or of procrastinating the acceptance of jurisdiction, and need not concern us further here.

Substantive Self-Restraint. Once a case has come before the Court on its merits, the justices are forced to give some explanation for whatever action they may take. Here self-restraint can take many forms, notably, the doctrine of political questions, the operation of judicial parsimony, and—particularly with respect to the actions of administrative officers or agencies—the theory of judicial inexpertise.

The doctrine of political questions is too familiar to require much elaboration here. Suffice it to say that if the Court feels that a question before it, *e.g.*, the legitimacy of a state government,[25] the validity of a legislative apportionment,[26] or the correctness of executive action in the field of foreign relations,[27] is one that is not properly amenable to judicial settlement, it will refer the plaintiff to the "political" organs of government for any possible relief. The extent to which this doctrine is applied seems to be a direct coefficient of judicial egotism, for the definition of a political question can be expanded or contracted in accordian-like fashion to meet the exigencies of the times.[28] A juridical definition of the term is impossible, for at root the logic that supports it is circular: political questions are matters not soluble by the judicial process; matters not soluble by the judicial process are political questions. As an early dictionary explained, violins are small cellos, and cellos are large violins.

---

[21] *First,* whether the Smith Act violated the First Amendment guarantee of free speech, and, *second,* whether the Act was so indefinite as to constitute a violation of the Fifth Amendment guarantee of due process of law.

[22] 327 U. S. 304 (1946).

[23] *Ex parte Duncan,* 146 F.2d 576 (9th Cir. 1944); *cert. granted,* 324 U. S. 833 (1945).

[24] The Court, by an ingenious maneuver, avoided ruling on the legality of evacuation until December, 1944, almost two years after the policy was initiated, although it had an opportunity to do so in *Hirabayashi* v. *U. S.*, 320 U. S. 93 (1943). The technique utilized in the Hirabayashi case to avoid the evacuation issue is discussed later in this article.

[25] *Luther* v. *Borden,* 7 Howard 1 (1849); *Pacific States Telephone & Telegraph Co.* v. *Oregon,* 223 U. S. 118 (1912).

[26] *Colegrove* v. *Green,* 328 U. S. 549 (1946); *South* v. *Peters,* 339 U. S. 276 (1950).

[27] *Oetjen* v. *Central Leather Co.,* 246 U. S. 297 (1918).

Nor do examples help much in definition. While it is certainly true that the Court cannot mandamus a legislature to apportion a state in equitable fashion, it seems equally true that the Court is without the authority to force state legislators to implement unsegregated public education. Yet in the former instance the Court genuflected to the "political" organs and took no action, while in the latter it struck down segregation as violative of the Constitution.

Judicial parsimony is another major technique of substantive self-restraint. In what is essentially a legal application of Occam's razor, the Court has held that it will not apply any more principles to the settlement of a case than are absolutely necessary, *e.g.*, it will not discuss the constitutionality of a law if it can settle the instant case by statutory construction. Furthermore, if an action is found to rest on erroneous statutory construction, the review terminates at that point: the Court will not go on to discuss whether the statute, properly construed, would be constitutional. A variant form of this doctrine, and a most important one, employs the "case or controversy" approach, to wit, the Court, admitting the importance of the issue, inquires as to whether the litigant actually has standing to bring the matter up.

But while on the surface this technique of limitation appears to be quasi-automatic in operation, such is not always the case. For example, the Court held in the United Public Workers[29] and the Alaskan cannery workers[30] cases that the plaintiffs could not get adjudication until the laws they challenged had been employed against them; it also agreed to review the constitutionality of the New York Teacher Loyalty statute *before* anyone had been injured by its operations.[31] Similarly, the Court for years held that a state government had no standing to intervene *parens patriae* on behalf of the interests of its citizens,[32] but changed its mind in 1945 to permit Georgia to bring action under the antitrust laws against twenty railroads.[33]

A classic use of parsimony to escape from a dangerous situation occurred in connection with the evacuation of the Nisei from the West Coast in 1942. Gordon Hirabayashi, in an attempt to test the validity of the regulations clamped on the American-Japanese by the military, violated the curfew and refused to report to an evacuation center. He was convicted on both counts by the district court and sentenced to three months for each offense, the sentences to run *concurrently*. When the case came before the Supreme Court, the justices sustained his conviction for violating the *curfew*, but refused to examine the validity of the evacuation order on the ground that it would not make any difference to Harabayashi anyway; he was in for ninety days no matter what the Court did with evacuation.[34]

---

[28] See the excellent discussion by John P. Frank in *Supreme Court and Supreme Law*, ed. Edmond Cahn (Bloomington, 1954), pp. 36–47.

[29] *United Public Workers* v. *Mitchell*, 330 U. S. 75 (1947) [federal loyalty program].

[30] *Int'l Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, Local 37* v. *Boyd*, 347 U. S. 222 (1954) [reëntry provisions of McCarran Act].

[31] *Adler* v. *Board of Education*, 342 U. S. 485 (1952). See the discussion of standing by Ralph E. Bischoff in Cahn, pp. 26–36.

[32] *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon*, 262 U. S. 447 (1923); *Jones ex rel. Louisiana* v. *Bowles*, 322 U. S. 707 (1944).

[33] *Georgia* v. *Pennsylvania Railroad*, 324 U. S. 439 (1945).

A third method of utilizing substantive self-restraint is particularly useful in connection with the activities of executive departments or regulatory agencies, both state and federal. I have entitled it the doctrine of judicial *inexpertise*, for it is founded on the unwillingness of the Court to revise the findings of experts. The earmarks of this form of restraint are great deference to the holdings of the expert agency usually coupled with such a statement as "It is not for the federal courts to supplant the [Texas Railroad] Commission's judgment even in the face of convincing proof that a different result would have been better."[35] In this tradition, the Court has refused to question *some* exercises of discretion by the National Labor Relations Board,[36] the Federal Trade Commission,[37] and other federal and state agencies. But the emphasis on *some* gives the point away: in other cases, apparently on all fours with those in which it pleads its technical *inexpertise*, the Court feels free to assess evidence *de novo* and reach independent judgment on the technical issues involved. Without getting involved in the complexities of the *Ben Avon* case,[38] *Crowell* v. *Benson*,[39] or *FPC* v. *Hope Natural Gas Co.*,[40] we need only cite the instance of *N.L.R.B.* v. *Highland Park Manufacturing Co.*, in which the Court overruled the N.L.R.B.[41] The Board had held that the C.I.O. was not a "national union" within the meaning of the Taft-Hartley Act, but was rather a confederation of labor unions, but Justice Jackson announced for the Court that "the C.I.O. . . . is certainly in the speech of people a national union, whatever its internal composition."[42] Justices Frankfurter and Douglas dissented, suggesting that the Supreme Court was not qualified to replace the Board.[43]

In short, with respect to expert agencies, the Court is equipped with both offensive and defensive gambits. If it chooses to intervene, one set of precedents is brought out, while if it decides to hold back, another set of equal validity is invoked. Perhaps the best summary of this point was made by Justice Harlan in 1910, when he stated bluntly that "the Courts have rarely, if ever, felt themselves so restrained by technical rules that they could not find some remedy, consistent with the law, for acts . . . that violated natural justice or were hostile to the fundamental principles devised for the protection of the essential rights of property."[44]

---

[34] *Hirabayashi* v. *U. S.*, 320 U. S. 93 (1943).

[35] *Railroad Commission of Texas* v. *Rowan & Nichols Oil Co.*, 310 U. S. 573 (1940).

[36] *NLRB* v. *Hearst Publications*, 322 U. S. 111 (1944).

[37] *FTC* v. *Ruberoid Co.*, 343 U. S. 470 (1952).

[38] *Ohio Valley Water Co.* v. *Ben Avon Borough*, 253 U.S. 287 (1920) [independent judicial reëvaluation of administrative holding].

[39] *Crowell* v. *Benson*, 285 U. S. 22 (1932) [use of doctrine of jurisdictional fact to justify *de novo* trial of administrative adjudication].

[40] *FPC* v. *Hope Natural Gas Co.*, 320 U. S. 591 (1944) [presumptive validity of rate determination if the result is "just and reasonable"].

[41] 341 U. S. 322 (1951).

[42] *Ibid.*, at 324.

[43] "The best source for us in determining whether a term used in the field of industrial relations has a technical connotation is the body to which Congress has committed the administration of the statute." *Ibid.*, at 327.

This does not pretend to be an exhaustive analysis of the techniques of judicial self-restraint;[45] on the contrary, others will probably find many which are not given adequate discussion here. The remainder of this paper, however, is devoted to the second area of concern: the conditions under which the Court refrains from acting.

THE CONDITIONS OF JUDICIAL SELF-RESTRAINT

The conditions which lead the Supreme Court to exercise auto-limitation are many and varied. In the great bulk of cases, this restraint is an outgrowth of sound and quasi-automatic legal maxims which defy teleological interpretation. It would take a master of the conspiracy theory of history to assign meaning, for example, to the great majority of certiorari denials; the simple fact is that these cases do not merit review. However, in a small proportion of cases, purpose does appear to enter the picture, sometimes with a vengeance. It is perhaps unjust to the Court to center our attention on this small proportion, but it should be said in extenuation that these cases often involve extremely significant political and social issues. In the broad picture, the refusal to grant certiorari in 1943 to the Minneapolis Trotskyites convicted under the Smith Act is far more meaningful than the similar refusal to grant five hundred petitions to prison "lawyers" who have suddenly discovered the writ of habeas corpus. Likewise, the holding that the legality of congressional apportionment is a "political question" vitally affects the operation of the whole democratic process.

What we must therefore seek are the conditions under which the Court holds back *in this designated category of cases*. Furthermore, it is important to realize that there are positive consequences of negative action: as Charles Warren has implied,[46] the post-Civil War Court's emphasis on self-restraint was a judicial concomitant of the resurgence of states'-rights. Thus self-restraint may, as in wartime, be an outgrowth of judicial caution, or it may be part of a purposeful pattern of abdicating national power to the states.

Ever since the first political scientist discovered Mr. Dooley, the changes have been rung on the aphorism that the Supreme Court "follows the election returns," and I see no particular point in ringing my variation on this theme through again.[47] Therefore, referring those who would like a more detailed explanation to earlier analyses,[48] the discussion here will be confined to the bare bones of my hypothesis.

---

[44] *Monongahela Bridge Co.* v. *U.S.*, 216 U.S. 177 at 195 (1910).

[45] The "presumption of constitutionality" might be considered as a separate technique of judicial self-restraint, but I consider it as a variant of judicial parsimony, a point of departure for applying Occam's razor.

[46] *The Supreme Court in United States History*, Vol. 2, pp. 533–61.

The power of the Supreme Court to invade the decision-making arena, I submit, is a consequence of that fragmentation of political power which is normal in the United States. No cohesive majority, such as normally exists in Britain, would permit a politically irresponsible judiciary to usurp decision-making functions, but, for complex social and institutional reasons, there are few issues in the United States on which cohesive majorities exist. The guerrilla warfare which usually rages between Congress and the President, as well as the internal civil wars which are endemic in both the legislature and the administration, give the judiciary considerable room for maneuver. If, for example, the Court strikes down a controversial decision of the Federal Power Commission, it will be supported by a substantial bloc of congressmen; if it supports the FPC's decision, it will also receive considerable congressional support. But the important point is that *either* way it decides the case, there is no possibility that Congress will exact any vengeance on the Court for its action. A disciplined majority would be necessary to clip the judicial wings, and such a majority does not exist on this issue.

On the other hand, when monolithic majorities do exist on issues, the Court is likely to resort to judicial self-restraint. A good case here is the current tidal wave of anti-communist legislation and administrative action, the latter particularly with regard to aliens, which the Court has treated most gingerly. About the only issues on which there can be found cohesive majorities are those relating to national defense, and the Court has, as Clinton Rossiter demonstrated in an incisive analysis,[49] traditionally avoided problems arising in this area irrespective of their constitutional merits. Like the slave who accompanied a Roman consul on his triumph whispering "You too are mortal," the shade of Thad Stevens haunts the Supreme Court chamber to remind the justices what an angry Congress can do.

To state the proposition in this brief compass is to oversimplify it considerably. I have, for instance, ignored the crucial question of how the Court knows when a majority *does* exist, and I recognize that certain aspects of judicial behavior cannot be jammed into my hypothesis without creating essentially spurious epicycles. However, I am not trying to establish a monistic theory of judicial action; group action, like that of individuals, is motivated by many factors, some often contradictory, and my objective is to elucidate what seems to be one tradition of judicial motivation. In short, judicial self-restraint and judicial power seem to be opposite sides of the same coin: it has been by judicious application of the former that the latter has been maintained. A tradition beginning with Marshall's *coup* in *Marbury* v. *Madison* and running through *Mississippi* v. *Johnson* and *Ex Parte Vallandigham* to *Dennis* v. *United States* suggests that the Court's power has been maintained by a wise refusal to employ it in unequal combat.[50]

---

[47] See the treatment of this problem by Professor Pritchett, *op. cit.*, Ch. 13.

[48] See "Executive Power and Domestic Emergency: The Quest for Prerogative," *op. cit.*, "Education, Segregation and the Supreme Court—A Political Analysis," *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, Vol. 99, pp. 949–59 (May, 1951); "Plessy v. Ferguson: *Requiescat in Pace*?," *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, Vol. 103, pp. 46–58 (Oct., 1954); and Roche and Stedman, Ch. 10.

[49] *The Supreme Court and the Commander-in-Chief* (Ithaca, 1951).

---

[50] While this article was wending its leisurely way towards publication, the federal courts have begun to emphasize an interesting variant of judicial self-restraint in civil rights cases. Without ruling on the merits of cases at bar, judges in several key cases have utilized procedural grounds to frustrate government action. In San Francisco, a district judge ruled that the United States had not adequately sustained its evidential burden against Harry Bridges, thus saving the latter from denaturalization. In New York, the contempt of Congress indictments of Corliss Lamont and others similarly situated were quashed on the ground that the true bill did not proclaim the *vires* of the subcommittee before which the contempts were allegedly committed. After a long and complicated legal battle, the Court of Appeals, District of Columbia, quashed the key charge in the perjury indictment of Owen Lattimore, and the same Court undermined the plenary jurisdiction of the Passport Division of the State Department by requiring an adherence to due process in passport denials. Finally, in *Peters* v. *Hobby*, 349 U.S. 341 (1955), the Supreme Court—on a basis so narrow as to be virtually invisible (*i.e.*, that the Loyalty Review Board was *ultra vires* in reopening, by its own action, the case of Dr. Peters)—overruled Peters' dismissal. Perhaps henceforth the protection of civil liberties will be effected by procedural meticulousness! This is not a new technique: in the seventeenth century it was applied by the British courts to mitigate the substantive injustices of outlawry. Even misspellings in the writ of exigent were employed to invalidate the proceedings as, for instance, in *Griffith* v. *Thomas*, Style 334 (1652), where the error of spelling *praecipimus* praecipipimus was held to be fatal.

PARTY VOTING IN AMERICAN STATE LEGISLATURES

MALCOLM E. JEWELL
Pennsylvania State University

The political systems of American states have remained, until recent years, a neglected field of study. Students of state government have found it easier to make meaningful comparisons of administration or legislative organization than to capture on paper the dynamic political forces which appear to be unique in each state and often are completely transformed by each group of personalities that wander on and off the political stage. V. O. Key's excellent study of the political forces in Southern states pointed up the lack of similar surveys of Northern states.[1]

In particular, the role of political parties in state legislatures has been largely ignored. The report of the American Political Science Association Committee on American Legislatures points out this problem and also notes that "it has been generally assumed that partisanship counts for less in most state legislatures than it does in Congress."[2] Professor Lowell's famous study in 1901, which showed a comparatively low level of party voting in all of the five states he studied except New York, provided the empirical evidence for a conclusion that has been widely shared by later writers.[3]

Several writers in recent years have re-examined this question by detailed studies of specific American legislatures, and have reached conclusions which are at variance with one another.[4] The study that follows is a comparison of the extent of party voting in the legislatures of eight American states that have the basic prerequisite for a significant degree of party influence: a reasonably strong and healthy two-party system. This study points up the wide variety in the extent of party voting and the relatively high level in the larger urban states.

It is obvious that there are many states which have been so dominated by one party in recent years that partisan factors can have no significant influence over legislative voting habits. Into this category would fall the eleven Southern states, and twelve others—five with Democratic and seven with Republican records over at least the past quarter-century. There are two states with non-partisan legislatures and one, Wisconsin, with a unique blend of Republican and Progressive control over part of the last two decades. It cannot be said that each of the remaining twenty-two states has had a consistently vigorous two-party system, but in none of them has one party controlled both the governorship and the two houses of the legislature for as much as sixteen of the last twenty years. These are the states in which there is more likely to be a reflection of partisan activity in the legislature. The eight states chosen for examination in this study are among these twenty-two having at least a semblance of an effective two-party system.

---

[1] V. O. Key, Jr., *Southern Politics in State and Nation* (New York, 1949).

[2] *American State Legislatures*, ed. Belle Zeller (New York, 1954), p. 189.

[3] A. Lawrence Lowell, "The Influence of Party upon Legislation in England and America," *Annual Report of the American Historical Society for the Year 1901*, Vol. 1, pp. 319–542 (1902).

[4] See W. Duane Lockard, "Legislative Politics in Connecticut," this REVIEW, Vol. 48, pp. 166–73 (March, 1954); William J. Keefe, "Party Government and Lawmaking in the Illinois General Assembly," *Northwestern University Law Review*, Vol. 47, pp. 55–71 (March, 1952); and William J. Keefe, "Parties, Partisanship, and Public Policy in the Pennsylvania Legislature," this REVIEW, Vol. 48, pp. 450–64 (June, 1954). Comparisons with these studies are made later in this paper.

Methods of Research. This study of the influence of party in legislative voting is limited to sessions in which the party balance in the legislature was reasonably close, for it was assumed that there would be less party voting, even in strong two-party states, during the years of one-sided legislative control. Two legislative sessions have been chosen for study whenever necessary to get a sample large enough for statistical significance.

For each session, every roll call printed in the legislative journals has been examined. In all of the states studied, except Massachusetts, a roll call is required on the final passage of every bill, resulting in a very large total number of roll calls. No record was made of unanimous roll calls or of those in which at least 90 per cent of the Republicans voted on the same side as 90 per cent of the Democrats. The number of nearly or completely unanimous roll calls is very large, but such roll calls prove nothing about the role of parties on issues which provoked disagreement in the legislature.[5] Every other roll call has been included in these calculations, whether on an amendment, final passage of a bill, or any other question, except in a few cases where the number of roll calls on one issue was so large as to distort the total figures.[6] The duplicating vote on emergency clauses in Missouri and Colorado has also been omitted. No attempt has been made to give added weight to bills considered of major importance. No record has been made of independent or third-party voters or of those who abstained from voting on an issue.

The roll-call totals have been translated into the index of cohesion according to the system suggested by Stuart Rice.[7] When all members of a party vote on one side of an issue the index is 100; when they are evenly divided it is 0. All of the roll-call votes of each party have been divided into three classes: those with a party index of cohesion of 80–100 (90–100 per cent of the members on one side), those with an index of 40–79 (70–89 per cent on one side), and those with an index of 0–39 (50–69 per cent on one side).

No simple formula can describe accurately the degree of party voting in the roll calls of a state, but there are certain keys to an understanding of the complex statistics. First, on what percentage of all the roll calls did a majority of the two parties take opposite sides of a question? Obviously this percentage will tend to vary with the degree of party influence. Second, within this group of roll calls, how much unity did each of the parties display? Third, within this group of roll calls with the parties opposed, how many produced a high level of unity in both parties? For this purpose we have defined as a "party vote" an index of cohesion of 80 in both parties. Fourth, among the roll calls with a majority of both parties on the same side, did either party have a much higher degree of unity than the other?

---

[5] Eliminating these two categories facilitates comparison between the states requiring a roll call on all bills and those (e.g., Massachusetts) that do not. Inclusion of these categories in the studies by other writers has been a major factor leading them to apparently contradictory conclusions about party influence in legislatures of various states.

[6] The omitted roll calls were 30 on two issues in the 1945 session of the Washington Senate and 51 on one issue in the 1947 session of the Colorado House.

[7] Stuart Rice, *Quantitative Methods in Politics* (New York, 1928), p. 209.

The eight states studied contain over one-third of the people in this country; most of these states are large and urban. The 2,743 roll calls furnish a representative sample of party voting in the legislatures of strong two-party states during periods of close party competition. The study does not examine the role of party leaders and party factions in committees in bringing bills to a vote or blocking them, a subject on which more research is necessary.

Massachusetts. Massachusetts has had a strongly competitive party system since the start of the New Deal. The two parties have shared the governor's chair equally in the last two decades. Although the legislature, through skillful gerrymandering, has had Republican majorities in nearly all of these years, the margin has been relatively close. In the year under study, 1947, the Republican administration had comfortable, but not one-sided, majorities in both legislative branches. Massachusetts is one of the few states in which every bill introduced must have a committee hearing, be reported out, and be voted on. Since party influence cannot kill a bill in committee, the roll-call study gives a more comprehensive picture of party activity than it does in most states. This is the only state studied which does not require roll calls on final passage of each bill. In Massachusetts, roll calls are demanded only on highly controversial and usually partisan bills. For this reason the percentage of votes with the parties on opposite sides is very high and is not truly comparable with the percentages in other states. Conversely, there are so few votes with the parties on the same side that differences in party unity in this category cannot be examined.

Within the category of roll calls with the parties on opposite sides, Table I shows a high level of party unity in both branches, particularly among the minority Democrats; only the Pennsylvania parties showed a higher degree of unity in this respect than the Massachusetts Democrats. Over three-quarters of the Democratic Senate votes shown to have a cohesion index of 80 or more represent party unanimity.

Almost one-third of the large number of roll calls on which the Democrats but not the Republicans had a cohesion index of 80 or more were on labor and welfare issues. This may in part reflect the conflicting pressures on Republicans from urban areas in the state. The difference in party unity might be expected to reflect the comfortable majority of the Republican party, but in over one-fifth of the roll calls on which the parties took opposite sides, the minority Democrats gained enough Republican votes to win.[8]

---

[8] In a study of party voting in a similar New England state legislature, Connecticut, for eleven sessions (1931–1951), W. Duane Lockard concluded that "parties, far from being relatively insignificant, play a dominating role." Connecticut, like Massachusetts,

TABLE I. PARTY VOTING IN MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATURE IN 1947*

	Percentage of Total Roll Calls			
	Senate N=133		House N=128	
Parties on Opposite Sides	93%		93%	
Index of Cohesion:				
Both parties 80–100[a]	38%		40%	
Each party 80–100	Rep. 42%	Dem. 74%	Rep. 48%	Dem. 68%
40–79	37	10	30	16
0–39	14	9	15	9
Parties on Same Side	7%		7%	
Index of Cohesion:				
Rep. 0–79 Dem. 80–100	2%		2%	
Rep. 80–100 Dem. 0–79	0		2	
Rep. 0–79 Dem. 0–79	5		3	

* Political composition: Governor—Republican
Senate—24 Republicans—16 Democrats
House—144 Republicans—96 Democrats

[a] In these tables, the percentage of roll calls for which the index of both parties was at least 80 is a subtotal of the similar figure given for each of the parties.

New York. New York has often been cited, by Professor Lowell and other observers, as one of the few states in which parties play a large role in legislative voting. This study shows that, among the eight states, only Pennsylvania outranked it in the overall degree of party voting. The size and diversity of New York's population and its key position in the electoral college have combined to give it a strong two-party system, although the balance of parties has been reflected more in the governorship than in the legislature. The Democrats have had control of one or both houses during only four out of the eight years they have held the governorship in the last two decades, while Republican governors have consistently had a legislative majority.

---

does not require roll calls on final passage of all bills and usually has an even lower number of total roll calls per session than does Massachusetts. This figure for Connecticut therefore presumably covers only the most controversial bills. Excluding the small number of unanimous votes (seven per cent in the Senate and three per cent in the House) from Lockard's statistics, we find that the parties took opposite sides in 90 per cent of the Senate votes and 83 per cent of the House votes, slightly less than in Massachusetts.

The Connecticut totals show a high level of unity for both parties, although unfortunately in this category the roll calls on which the parties agreed and disagreed are not separated. The percentage of all roll calls (excluding unanimous ones) on which each party had a cohesion index of 80 or more in the Senate was 59 per cent for the Democrats and 76 per cent for the Republicans, and in the House 83 per cent for the Democrats and 72 per cent for the Republicans. The Republicans controlled the House in all eleven sessions, and the Democrats controlled the Senate in most of the sessions. These figures are similar to the high levels in other urban, industrial states. (Presumably the number of roll calls with 90 per cent of both parties agreed, included by Mr. Lockard, was too small to distort the comparison in a state not requiring roll calls.) See Lockard, "Legislative Politics in Connecticut."

This study covers the legislative sessions of 1947 and 1949. In each session there was a Republican governor; in 1947 the Republicans had a large majority in the legislature, in 1949 a moderate majority.

Table II shows the high proportion of roll calls on which the parties were opposed; it also reveals a level of unity within this category that was consistently high and remarkably uniform for both parties in both houses. A breakdown of the figures shows little difference between the two sessions in the Senate, although both parties—particularly the Democrats—had slightly higher levels of unity among the votes with the parties opposed in 1947. The figures varied more in the House, mainly because the percentage of roll calls with the parties opposed dropped from 76 to 46 per cent from 1947 to 1949. Within this category, both parties, but particularly the Democrats, showed greater unity in 1947, when the party balance was more one-sided. This is an exception to the expected rule that closer party competition breeds greater party unity.

TABLE II. PARTY VOTING IN NEW YORK LEGISLATURE IN 1947 AND 1949*

	Percentage of Total Roll Calls			
	Senate N = 146		House N = 184	
Parties on Opposite Sides	62%		61%	
Index of Cohesion:				
Both parties 80–100	32%		34%	
Each party 80–100	Rep. 42%	Dem. 40%	Rep. 44%	Dem. 43%
40–79	12	12	13	10
0–39	8	10	4	8
Parties on Same Side	38%		39%	
Index of Cohesion:				
Rep. 0–79 Dem. 80–100	9%		14%	
Rep. 80–100 Dem. 0–79	23		11	
Rep. 0–79 Dem. 0–79	6		14	

* Political composition: 1947 Governor—Republican
Senate—41 Republicans—14 Democrats
House—109 Republicans—40 Democrats
1949 Governor—Republican
Senate—31 Republicans—25 Democrats
House—87 Republicans—63 Democrats

On the issues on which a majority of both parties were agreed, the Republicans showed more unity in both sessions of the Senate and in the 1947 House session, as is generally the case with majority parties, but the Democrats were more united in the 1949 House session.

Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania for a long time was one of the strongholds of the Republican party, which kept an unbroken grip on both legislative branches and the governorship for the first 34 years of this century. While the Democratic gain since the New Deal has not been as great as in some states, the party has held the governorship for four years and one or both houses for six years since 1934. Moreover, Democratic minorities have become much stronger than they were before the New Deal. The Republican margin over the Democrats averaged about two-to-one in the 1940's but was less in the 1945 session studied here.

This session provides the strongest example of party unity found in this study. The proportion of roll calls with the parties opposed shown in Table III was exceeded only in Massachusetts, where special circumstances have been noted. The level of unity in both parties and in both houses is extremely high.

TABLE III. PARTY VOTING IN PENNSYLVANIA LEGISLATURE IN 1945*

	Percentage of Total Roll Calls			
	Senate N=151		House N=147	
Parties on Opposite Sides	64%		81%	
Index of Cohesion:				
Both parties 80–100	52%		56%	
Each party 80–100	Rep. 56%	Dem. 59%	Rep. 64%	Dem. 62%
40–79	3	3	12	10
0–39	5	2	5	9
Parties on Same Side	36%		19%	
Index of Cohesion:				
Rep. 0–79 Dem. 80–100	11%		4%	
Rep. 80–100 Dem. 0–79	21		9	
Rep. 0–79 Dem. 0–79	4		6	

* Political composition: Governor—Republican
Senate—32 Republicans—18 Democrats
House—109 Republicans—99 Democrats

Pennsylvania is the only state where "party votes" (both parties with a cohesion index of 80 or more) were over 50 per cent of all the roll calls. An equally remarkable fact, not shown in the table, is that in one-third of the total votes every Democrat voted on one side and every Republican on the other.

The only significant difference between the parties is shown in the group of roll calls where the majority of both parties were agreed. Here, in accord with the general rule, the majority Republican party showed greater unity, having roughly twice as many votes with a cohesion index of 80 or above as did the Democrats.[9]

---

[9] William J. Keefe reached a different conclusion in a study of the 1951 Pennsylvania legislature, that "the policy decisions which confronted the Pennsylvania legislature were mainly nonpartisan." This is largely because 82 per cent of the Senate roll calls and 70 per cent of those in the House were unanimous. Keefe recognizes that the requirement for a roll call on all bills leads to this high figure. It would seem that the test of party voting should be concentrated on controversial issues that lead to some dispute.

If unanimous votes are excluded, Keefe's figures for 1951 appear to show somewhat less party voting than do those for 1945. In 1951 the percentage of roll calls with the parties

Ohio. Ohio, like New York, has a key position in the electoral college and a balance of large urban centers and rural areas, which has given it a strong two-party system. In the last twenty years the Democratic party has controlled the governorship for twelve years, but has had a majority in one or both houses only four years. Despite the close balance of parties, each has at times had one-sided control of the legislature. The governor was Republican in the first year selected for study (1941) and Democratic in the second (1945), but the Republican majority was larger in both branches of the legislature in 1945.

TABLE IV. PARTY VOTING IN OHIO LEGISLATURE IN 1941 AND 1945*

	Percentage of Total Roll Calls			
	Senate N=128		House N=289	
Parties on Opposite Sides	49%		38%	
Index of Cohesion:				
Both parties 80–100	23%		15%	
Each party 80–100	Rep. 37%	Dem. 29%	Rep. 25%	Dem. 19%
40–79	7	9	6	10
0–39	5	11	7	9
Parties on Same Side	51%		62%	
Index of Cohesion:				
Rep. 0–79 Dem. 80–100	27%		11%	
Rep. 80–100 Dem. 0–79	15		34	
Rep. 0–79 Dem. 0–79	9		17	

* Political composition: 1941 Governor—Republican
Senate—19 Republicans—17 Democrats
House—78 Republicans—60 Democrats
1945 Governor—Democrat
Senate—20 Republicans—13 Democrats
House—89 Republicans—47 Democrats

Table IV shows a level of party voting in Ohio which was lower than in some of the other large industrial states studied, but higher than in the smaller rural states. The Senate, with a closer margin between the parties, had a larger proportion of roll calls with the parties in disagreement, particularly in 1941. Within this category both parties showed more unity in the Senate than in the House, and in both chambers the majority Republicans were more unified than the Democrats. Democratic cohesion remained steady during the two

---

on opposite sides was 34 in the Senate and 43 in the House, compared to 64 and 81 in 1945. A large part of the difference is probably accounted for by the inclusion of roll calls with over 90 per cent of both parties in agreement, which in many states are very numerous. The party votes (both parties with an index of cohesion of at least 80) formed a high proportion of all votes on which the parties were opposed in both studies. The House figure for this was 69 per cent in both years, but the Senate figure dropped from 81 per cent in 1945 to 64 per cent in 1951. See Keefe, "Parties, Partisanship and Public Policy in the Pennsylvania Legislature." The party vote figures are based on a letter to the writer, January 10, 1955.

sessions, but Republican unity was somewhat greater in 1941, a difference that could have been caused by the closer party margin and the element of Republican gubernatorial leadership in that year.

Among the roll calls on which the parties agreed, the Ohio Republicans showed the expected greater unity in the House, where the figures were quite similar for both sessions. In the Senate, Democratic unity was greater, particularly in the 1945 session.

Illinois. Illinois also has a close balance of large urban and rural areas that has helped to maintain a strong two-party system, particularly since the New Deal period. In the last two decades, the Democratic party has held the governorship ten years and controlled one or both legislative chambers for eight years. The session under study (1949) was the first year of Adlai Stevenson's governorship, after eight Republican years. The Democrats had a narrow grip on the House, but only a respectable minority in the Senate.

TABLE V. PARTY VOTING IN ILLINOIS LEGISLATURE IN 1949*

	Percentage of Total Roll Calls			
	Senate N=207		House N=155	
Parties on Opposite Sides	53%		54%	
Index of Cohesion:				
Both parties 80–100	15%		17%	
Each party 80–100	Rep. 17%	Dem. 39%	Rep. 20%	Dem. 40%
40–79	24	7	17	8
0–39	12	7	17	6
Parties on Same Side	47%		46%	
Index of Cohesion:				
Rep. 0–79 Dem. 80–100	25%		34%	
Rep. 80–100 Dem. 0–79	11		4	
Rep. 0–79 Dem. 0–79	11		8	

* Political composition: Governor—Democrat
Senate—32 Republicans—18 Democrats
House—72 Republicans—80 Democrats

This Democratic rebirth may in part explain the outstanding feature in Illinois, the much higher level of party unity among the Democrats than among the Republicans. In general the state ranks close to Ohio in most of the indications of party voting shown in Table V. The proportion of roll calls with the parties opposed is just over half—about average for the eight states. The Democratic level of unity in this group was equally high in both branches of the legislature, with twice as many roll calls with an index of cohesion of at least 80 as in the case of the Republicans.

It is even more striking to compare the number of Senate roll calls where one party had absolute unity—73 for the Democrats and 13 for the Republicans. On more than one-fifth of the Senate roll calls on which the two parties were opposed, the Democratic minority gained enough Republican votes to win.

Welfare issues, taxation, and appropriations made up over half of the bills on which the parties were opposed and only the Democrats had an index of cohesion of at least 80. In the category of roll calls with party agreement, the Democrats showed far more unity, particularly in the House where they had a majority.[10]

Washington. The state of Washington has had a close balance of parties, has supported the winning presidential candidate in nearly every election in this century, and like other states with important urban areas has grown more Democratic since the start of the New Deal. The Democratic party has held the governorship for ten of the last twenty years, and has controlled both houses for fourteen years, with partial control four years. In the session chosen for study (1945), the Democratic party controlled the governorship and had a comfortable majority in both branches of the legislature.

TABLE VI. PARTY VOTING IN WASHINGTON LEGISLATURE IN 1945*

	Percentage of Total Roll Calls			
	Senate N = 190		House N = 133	
Parties on Opposite Sides	71%		51%	
Index of Cohesion:				
Both parties 80–100	9%		9%	
Each party 80–100	Rep. 46%	Dem. 16%	Rep. 23%	Dem. 25%
40–79	12	42	18	19
0–39	13	13	10	7
Parties on Same Side	29%		49%	
Index of Cohesion:				
Rep. 0–79 Dem. 80–100	15%		26%	
Rep. 80–100 Dem. 0–79	8		10	
Rep. 0–79 Dem. 0–79	6		13	

* Political composition: Governor—Democrat
Senate—14 Republicans—32 Democrats
House—36 Republicans—63 Democrats

While in general it may be said that the level of party unity shown in Table VI is above average, it is lower and less consistent in Washington than in larger industrial states studied, mainly because of great differences in party unity in the Senate. In the House the percentage of roll calls with the parties opposed is about average, but both parties have somewhat lower than average levels of unity. The Senate percentage of disagreed votes—71 per cent—is one of the highest, and within this group the Republican party showed much more unity in voting than the Democrats. Only in Massachusetts and Illinois were there such marked differences between the unity levels of the two parties within this category of votes. Washington is the only state in which the Republicans in either house surpassed the Democrats in unity by such a large margin. With regard to those roll calls on which the parties agreed, we find, as we might expect, a higher level of unity in the majority Democratic party.

---

[10] William J. Keefe, in a study of the Illinois sessions of 1949 and 1951, concluded that parties played a small role in lawmaking. As in his study of Pennsylvania, this resulted largely from the inclusion of unanimous votes, which averaged two-thirds of the total roll calls in the two Illinois sessions. It also resulted from the inclusion of roll calls on which at least 90 per cent of both parties voted on the same side. His figures show that the total of these roll calls exceeded all other non-unanimous roll calls in 1949. Keefe does not list the total number of roll calls on which the parties were opposed and does not compare the unity level of the two parties. These differences in standards make a comparison of the two sessions difficult, but Keefe did find that roll calls in which the parties were opposed and in which both had a high level of unity dropped from 1949 to 1951, particularly in the House. See Keefe, "Party, Government and Lawmaking in the Illinois General Assembly." The comparison is also based on the previously-mentioned letter to the writer.

Missouri. Missouri has had a close balance of parties and since 1904 has supported every winning presidential candidate; in state politics, however, it has been heavily Democratic. In the last two decades the Democratic party has controlled the governorship sixteen years, with the legislature Democratic in ten of these years, Republican in four, and divided in two. During the four years of Republican governorship the legislature was Democratic for two years and divided for the other two. During the session under study, which lasted through 1945 and 1946, the governor was Democratic and the legislature Republican by small margins in both chambers. Missouri, like Massachusetts, requires that all bills be reported out by committees, and hence a study of roll calls provides a particularly good test of total party influence.

Despite the close party competition in the state, and the close balance in this legislative session, Missouri parties exhibited less unity in voting than those in any other state in this survey. The proportion of votes with the parties opposed was the lowest, being less than one out of four in the Senate, as shown in Table VII. In both chambers the majority Republicans displayed more unity than the Democrats in this respect, suggesting that the influence of the Democratic governor over his party's voting was not strong. Contrary to our expectations, both parties displayed less unity in the Senate, where the Republican margin was only four; the Senate Democrats maintained the lowest level of unity discovered in this survey. When the two parties were in agreement, which was rather often, the majority Republican party showed a considerably higher level of unity than the minority Democrats in both chambers.

Colorado. Colorado has long had a close balance of parties. There has been a Republican governor for twelve of the last twenty years, eight with a Republican legislature, four with a divided legislature. During the eight Democratic gubernatorial years, control of the legislature was Democratic in four years, Republican in two, and divided in two. The two years under study are 1941, with a Republican governor and a divided legislature, and 1947, with a Democratic governor and a Republican legislature.

Table VIII shows that the general level of party unity was low. The proportion of roll calls with the parties on opposite sides was low in both sessions and surpassed only that in Missouri. Likewise within that category the level of party unity was the lowest in any state except Missouri. On these roll calls in

TABLE VII. PARTY VOTING IN MISSOURI LEGISLATURE IN 1945–1946*

	Percentage of Total Roll Calls			
	Senate N = 123		House N = 284	
Parties on Opposite Sides	23%		36%	
Index of Cohesion:				
Both parties 80–100	1%		9%	
Each party 80–100	Rep. 8%	Dem. 3%	Rep. 17%	Dem. 13%
40–79	5	7	12	11
0–39	10	13	7	12
Parties on Same Side	77%		64%	
Index of Cohesion:				
Rep. 0–79 Dem. 80–100	17%		15%	
Rep. 80–100 Dem. 0–79	33		30	
Rep. 0–79 Dem. 0–79	27		19	

* Political composition: Governor—Democrat
Senate—19 Republicans—15 Democrats
House—81 Republicans—69 Democrats

1941 both majority parties—the Senate Democrats and the House Republicans—displayed slightly more unity than the minority parties. In 1947, under a Democratic governor, the minority Democrats showed slightly more unity

TABLE VIII. PARTY VOTING IN COLORADO LEGISLATURE IN 1941 AND 1947*

	Percentage of Total Roll Calls			
	Senate N = 198		House N = 147	
Parties on Opposite Sides	36%		38%	
Index of Cohesion:				
Both parties 80–100	6%		7%	
Each party 80–100	Rep. 10%	Dem. 14%	Rep. 16%	Dem. 15%
40–79	12	14	11	11
0–39	14	8	11	12
Parties on Same Side	64%		62%	
Index of Cohesion:				
Rep. 0–79 Dem. 80–100	31%		23%	
Rep. 80–100 Dem. 0–79	20		24	
Rep. 0–79 Dem. 0–79	13		15	

* Political composition: 1941 Governor—Republican
Senate—17 Republicans—18 Democrats
House—37 Republicans—28 Democrats
1947 Governor—Democrat
Senate—27 Republicans—8 Democrats
House—46 Republicans—19 Democrats

than the Republicans in both branches, and there was more party unity generally in the House than in the Senate.

In the category of roll calls with the parties on the same side, the general rule of greater unity in the majority party applied only to the 1941 Senate (where the majority was very small) and the 1947 House (where the majority was very large). The opposite result was found in the 1941 House, and the two parties were even in the 1947 Senate.

Summary of Party Voting. Table IX, which summarizes the results of this study, presents no clear picture of consistently higher levels of unity among either majority or minority party, Democratic or Republican, except on roll

TABLE IX. SUMMARY OF PARTY VOTING IN AMERICAN STATE LEGISLATURES

State Legislature		% Roll Calls Out of Total		% Roll Calls of Those with Parties Opposed		% Roll Calls of Those with Parties Same Side*	
		Parties Opposed	Parties Opposed Both with 80 Cohesion Index	80 Cohesion Index Majority	80 Cohesion Index Minority	80 Cohesion Index Majority	80 Cohesion Index Minority
Mass.	S	93%	38%	R 45%	D 80%	Negligible	
	H	93	40	R 52	D 73	Negligible	
New York	S	62	32	R 68	D 64	R 72%	D 28%
	H	61	34	R 73	D 70	R 44	D 56
Penna.	S	64	52	R 88	D 91	R 65	D 35
	H	81	56	R 79	D 76	R 68	D 32
Ohio	S	49	23	R 75	D 59	R 36	D 64
	H	38	15	R 65	D 50	R 76	D 24
Illinois	S	53	15	R 33	D 74	R 31	D 69
	H	54	17	D 74	R 36	D 90	R 10
Wash.	S	71	9	D 23	R 65	D 66	R 34
	H	51	9	D 48	R 44	D 73	R 27
Missouri	S	23	1	R 32	D 11	R 66	D 34
	H	36	9	R 49	D 38	R 67	D 33
Col. 1941	S	34	5	D 39	R 30	D 70	R 30
	H	42	5	R 39	D 30	R 43	D 57
1947	S	38	8	R 29	D 37	R 50	D 50
	H	35	11	R 43	D 52	R 61	D 39

* Roll calls on which neither party had a cohesion index of 80 or more are excluded from these two columns.

calls which found the parties in agreement. On these votes we have found a higher level of unity in the majority party, which in many states achieved a cohesion index of at least 80 twice as often as did the minority party. When there is only limited dissent to a bill, concentrated in one party, that party is usually the minority party. The few exceptions shown in Table IX follow no clear pattern. It might be expected that if the minority party ever displayed greater unity on these issues it would be when it controlled the governorship. This would seem to explain the greater Senate Democratic unity in Illinois and in one Ohio session, but certainly not the other examples of minority unity, in New York and Colorado.

Far more interesting and more important is the summary of roll-call voting on questions that led the parties to take opposite sides. Here the legislative bodies with greater majority party and minority party unity almost balance out, as do the examples of greater Democratic and Republican unity. The Republicans are more often united in the majority and the Democrats more often in the minority, but only because the Republicans controlled most of the legislatures examined. In the 1947 Colorado session and the 1949 Illinois session the greater Democratic unity probably reflects loyalty to the Democratic administration, but similar loyalty was notably absent among the Missouri Democrats and the Massachusetts Republicans. In Washington the disunity among the majority Democratic party in the Senate was due to a small bloc of senators who generally voted with the Republicans. The parties shared nearly equally in the high level of unity evident in New York and Pennsylvania.

Table IX shows that the states under study can be divided into three groups according to the level of partisanship in the legislature of each. The highest level is in Pennsylvania, New York, and Massachusetts. There is a lower level in the second group, Ohio, Illinois, and Washington, with wide variations between the parties in the latter two states. The lowest level of unity is found in Colorado and Missouri. These differences suggest that, among states with a relatively vigorous two-party system, a higher degree of party voting does not result primarily from more intense party competition. We must assume that continuing one-party monopoly of the governorship and a large legislative majority diminish the party influence over legislative voting. The three states with the highest levels of party unity, however, are ones with long records of Republican legislative control, with only a few Democratic years, while the Democrats frequently held large legislative minorities and (except in Pennsylvania) won control of the governorship quite often. The balance between the parties in recent years appears to have been closer in Missouri and Colorado, the two states with the lowest levels of unity. Clearly partisan influences are more pronounced in the legislatures of the larger, more urban, and more industrial states, and not so pronounced in states with smaller and less urban populations, such as Missouri and Colorado, and to some extent Washington.[11]

---

[11] By comparison, Professor Lowell's study in 1901, which used virtually the same criteria as this study, showed high party unity in New York, less in Ohio and Illinois, and

The Urban-Rural Factor in Party Voting. One factor leading to greater party voting in states with a higher urban concentration is that in most of these states party strength follows more consistently an urban-rural division. In the larger urban states the parties represent more clearly defined groups of interests, with the Democrats coming mainly from the largest cities and metropolitan areas, and the Republicans more representative of the smaller cities and rural areas.[12] In the more rural states, such as Washington and particularly Missouri and Colorado, which have less party voting, both Democratic and Republican legislative strength is widely scattered throughout the state, although the Democrats tend to dominate the few larger cities. In these states the parties are less representative of distinct interest groups, and shifting coalitions of sectional interests are likely to have more influence over legislative voting. An examination of the individual states shows a rough correlation between a high level of party voting and a clear urban-rural alignment of the two parties. It also shows that on many occasions when one party is considerably more homogeneous than the other—whether it is largely urban or rural—it has also more voting cohesion.

The clearest examples of party division along urban-rural lines are found in the three states with highest party voting. In New York, 98 per cent of the Democrats and 34 per cent of the Republicans in both branches of the legislature for the years studied came from New York City and the counties containing four of the largest cities. In Massachusetts, 87 per cent of the Democrats and 36 per cent of the Republicans came from Boston and thirteen of the largest cities. In Pennsylvania, 79 per cent of the Democrats and 41 per cent of the Republicans came from the counties containing Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and nine of the other largest cities. Despite the extremely high homogeneity of the New York Democrats, the Republicans, split between New York City and upstate, had somewhat greater unity. In contrast the Massachusetts Democrats, largely from big cities, exceeded the geographically divided Republicans in unity. In Pennsylvania, the Democrats were somewhat more homogeneous, but the Republicans equalled them in unity.

Although Ohio lagged well behind the first three states in party voting, it had almost as much party homogeneity. There 75 per cent of the Democrats came from the counties containing Cleveland and eleven of the next largest cities

---

very little in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania. He noted that only these latter two states had large and consistent Republican majorities.

The parties took opposite sides in about one-half of the roll calls in three states, and in somewhat more than half in Massachusetts and New York. The percentage of party votes (the parties opposed and both with a cohesion index *over* 80, by his standard) was 23 and 45 in the New York Senate and House, 15 and 10 in the Ohio Senate and House, 13 in the Illinois House, and from one to six in the other legislative bodies. The Democrats had much more unity than the Republicans in Massachusetts, somewhat more in New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, and less in Illinois. See Lowell, "The Influence of Party upon Legislation in England and America."

[12] For the sake of convenience and brevity this "metropolitan and big city versus small city and rural" alignment is described in this paper as urban-rural.

but the remainder were well scattered, while 33 per cent of the Republicans came from these big-city areas, none of them from Cleveland. The more homogeneous Republicans had more voting cohesion.

Illinois had as much voting discipline as Ohio, and more in the Democratic party, although the cumulative voting system gave each party at least one of the three members in each representative district in the state. The counties containing Chicago and the next five largest cities included 56 per cent of the Democrats and 39 per cent of the Republicans.

In Washington the Democrats, who were the weaker of the two parties in voting discipline, had half of their representation in the counties containing the three largest cities, where the Republicans had 39 per cent of their strength. The remaining Democrats were widely scattered in the state.

In Colorado and Missouri, states with the lowest voting cohesion, about 40 per cent of the Democratic strength lay in counties containing the two or three largest cities. But the lack of more large cities resulted in the remainder of Democratic legislative strength being widely dissipated, particularly in Missouri, where it was spread among 42 other counties. Only one-fourth of the Colorado Republicans and a negligible proportion of the Missouri Republicans represented these few big-city areas.

Disunity in a party with widely scattered representation would logically be caused by dissenting legislators representing areas where the party is not dominant. Studies of individual voting records on selected issues in Illinois and Washington suggest the extent to which this is true. In Illinois twenty roll calls in the Senate and thirteen in the House, covering a variety of issues, were selected; on these Republican cohesion was considerably lower than Democratic. (Examples of the opposite situation were too few for useful comparison.) Among the Republican Cook County senators and representatives, 54 per cent voted against their party on at least 30 per cent of the roll calls. Of the rest of the Republicans, only 22 per cent showed this degree of independence. Among the downstate Republican dissenters only a few came from big-city districts or predominantly Democratic areas.

In Washington the low level of Democratic cohesion in the Senate was directly attributable to a remarkably tight-knit bloc of nine Democratic senators, generally referred to in the press as the "conservative Democrats." On 16 selected issues, these nine senators each joined the Republican side in 11 or more cases; no other Democratic senator left the fold on more than two of these roll calls. Although Democratic unity was greater in the House, it is possible to distinguish 17 representatives who voted somewhat frequently with the Republican party. Out of this group of 26 senators and representatives, only three were among the 29 Democrats from the cities of Seattle and Tacoma where the party was strongest. The proportion of rebellious Democrats was one-third in the remaining, less urbanized parts of the western section of Washington which the Democrats dominated, and nearly one-half in the Republican-dominated eastern section, which included one large Democratic city.

These two small-scale examples cannot provide any definite rule, nor can the somewhat irregular correlation of voting discipline and party homogeneity provide an absolute formula for party unity. One cannot ignore factors of gubernatorial and other party leadership and the changing pattern of political controversies. However, larger and more urbanized states do appear to have produced a pattern in which parties reflect urban-rural rather than merely sectional divisions and have therefore achieved greater cohesion in legislative voting. This affects both parties although generally only the Democrats have markedly greater homogeneity in the more urbanized states.

TABLE X. PARTY VOTING ON SPECIFIC ISSUES IN AMERICAN STATE LEGISLATURES

Type of Issue	Number of Party Votes*	% of Party Votes* out of Total Roll Calls on Issue
Elections and Reapportionment	65	44%
Appointments	12	44
National Issues	12	44
Labor	52	41
Appropriations	68	38
Legis. Procedure & Organization	47	37
Taxation	62	29
Veterans Affairs	8	28
Welfare, Health, Education	79	22
Civil Service	28	21
State Administration	16	19
Local Administration	15	14
Judicial and Legal	21	11
Business Regulation	14	6
Other Issues	84	11
	Total 583	Average 21%

* Party votes are those on which the parties are opposed and both have an index of cohesion of at least 80.

This demonstrated effect of the urban-rural division on party cohesion makes imperative a statistical breakdown of the roll calls by the type of issue involved, in order to determine whether in some or all states there is more voting by party on certain types of issues, such as those closely related to the urban-rural conflict of interests.

Party Voting and Issues. Table X shows a breakdown of the roll calls into fourteen categories most often productive of party votes. The number of party votes (the two parties opposed, each with a cohesion index of 80 or more) is shown for each, together with the percentage of party votes out of the total number of votes on the issue. Bills governing elections, labor, appropriations and taxation, and questions of legislative organization and procedure gave rise to the most active party voting. These five issues, with which 29 per cent of all votes in the legislature were concerned, constituted just over 50 per cent of the party votes. Confirmation of appointments, resolutions on national issues, and veterans legislation were issues that seldom came up but commanded a high percentage of party votes. There were many party votes on welfare bills (including those dealing with health and education) but they represented only an average percentage of the large total of bills of this sort.

The higher level of party voting in urban states could reflect greater party unity on certain types of issues in two ways. The most partisan issues might arise more often in urban states; or party cohesion might be particularly high on these issues in the urban states. Although too detailed analysis would founder on the limited totals available from a few legislative sessions, a breakdown of total votes and party votes by issue and state gives evidence of both of these trends.

In some urban states many election and reapportionment bills were voted on, but there were fewer such bills in other states, including Missouri and Colorado. Most urban states had a high proportion of party votes on these issues, but Missouri and Colorado did not.

Taxation and appropriations together gave rise to a large number of votes in all of the states examined except Massachusetts. These issues might be expected to cause a high level of party voting in all states, since they are essential to the prestige and success of any administration. In the four urban states other than Massachusetts these two issues resulted in a high level of party voting, but in Missouri, Colorado, and Washington the number of party votes was negligible—only four out of a total of 150 roll calls on these issues.

Questions of legislative procedure and organization came up fairly regularly in most states. These are questions of narrow party interest, and it is not surprising that the percentage of party votes on them was uniformly high.

There were a substantial number of labor bills voted on in all states except Illinois, Missouri, and Washington. In the urban states these led to a generally high proportion of party voting, but in rural Colorado, which had more roll calls on labor bills than any other state, only four of the 31 were party votes. Labor bills in the various states resulted in many roll calls with a high level of unity for one of the parties but not both.

Welfare issues (including health and education) came up frequently in every state except Pennsylvania; the proportion of party votes on these issues was moderately high—from 22 to 53 per cent in the five urban states. But in Washington, Colorado, and Missouri party votes averaged only four per cent of the total number of welfare bills. In most of the urban states, particularly Massachusetts and Illinois, this was one of the issues on which the Democrats most frequently displayed greater unity than the Republicans; in Washington the reverse was the case. These are the three states, incidentally, with the greatest difference in unity between the parties.

Appointments, national issues, and veterans affairs came up too infrequently to permit a meaningful breakdown, but both urban and rural states usually showed a relatively high proportion of party votes whenever any of these issues arose several times.

The remaining categories that have been treated separately—state and local administration, legal and judicial affairs, civil service, and business regulation—covered a significant proportion of the total roll calls, each of them being numerous in most states. The level of party voting on these issues was generally low, varying less from state to state than more partisan issues; it was highest, however, in Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and New York.

We conclude that the more partisan issues did arise somewhat more often in the large urban states. But the higher party voting record in these states was primarily a direct result of much more party cohesion on those very partisan issues.

In general it may be said that the issues most significant for party voting fall into three classifications: those which involve rather narrow party interest—election laws and the legislature; those which involve the basic policy and prestige of the administration and are therefore sensitive to party pressure—appropriations, taxes, and appointments; and those which involve social and economic issues and reflect national liberal-conservative party alignments—labor, welfare, and most national issues.

William J. Keefe has emphasized that the political parties in Pennsylvania and Illinois have quite narrow interests, comparable to those of other pressure groups; these interests occasioned a substantial proportion of the party votes in the legislature, which he estimated at about one-fourth in Pennsylvania.[13] These interests may not always be evident on the surface, but may motivate votes on appointments, local and state administration, and judicial organization, as well as those on elections and legislative organization. Votes on matters as crucial to the administration as taxes and appropriations may reflect party pressure for favors. There needs to be more study of the motivation for high party unity on such issues in the various states.

The highly partisan character of social and economic issues in the larger, urban states suggests that party systems in some of these states not only are strong but reflect to a considerable extent the liberal-conservative, urban-rural alignment of the national parties. It is frequently argued that party voting in the state legislatures is low because "the two major parties are divided mainly on national issues that do not figure greatly in the politics of the states."[14] It is likely that this premise holds true for fewer states than it once did.

We have already noted that in the larger, urban states under study the Democratic legislators were identified with large metropolitan areas and the Republicans with smaller cities and rural areas; this is the familiar pattern of national politics outside of the South. In the Northern industrial states the New Deal not only reinvigorated the two-party system at the state level, but also may have been instrumental in developing a pattern of state party interests similar to that on the national level. The state Democrats, like the national Democrats, probably more often champion pro-labor legislation, larger welfare benefits, and greater control over business. A large proportion of the issues arising at the state level are similar to those which dominate domestic national politics. Although more comprehensive research is necessary on the pattern of state legislative voting and the sources of state party strength, it seems reasonable to conclude that in our larger, more urbanized states the partnership of national and state parties is not so illogical as is often claimed.

---

[13] See Keefe, "Parties, Partisanship and Public Policy in the Pennsylvania Legislature," and "Party Government and Lawmaking in the Illinois General Assembly."

[14] See *American State Legislatures*, pp. 189–92.

CONCLUSIONS

1. In many of the American states with a strong two-party system, during sessions when party balance in the legislature is not one-sided, partisan considerations influence to a significant degree the legislative voting on issues about which there is some measure of disagreement.

2. Among these states with two strong parties, those with the most intense party competition are not necessarily those with the highest levels of party voting.

3. Neither the majority nor minority party, the Republican nor the Democratic, demonstrates consistently higher cohesion than its opponent in voting on issues which find a majority of the two parties opposed to each other.

4. Dissenters in a vote on which the majority of both parties agree are more frequently found in the minority party.

5. Legislative voting records suggest that the effectiveness of the governor in inducing unity in his party varies greatly from state to state.

6. The degree of party voting appears to be significantly higher in those two-party states which are larger and more urban. In these states more than in rural states the Democratic party represents the big-city, metropolitan areas, and the Republican party the smaller cities and rural districts.

7. The most partisan issues in the legislatures of all states, and particularly the large, urban states, involve narrow party interests, the prestige and fiscal program of the administration, and economic and social issues.

8. This record suggests that in the large industrial states, where the two-party system has been invigorated by national political forces which the New Deal unleashed, a high level of party voting in the legislature results from party alignments which have largely followed the liberal-conservative, urban-rural pattern of national politics.

DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

IN AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES*

COMPILED BY WILLIAM C. SEYLER†

Deputy Secretary, Department of Internal Affairs, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

I. DISSERTATIONS IN PREPARATION

POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY AND PSYCHOLOGY

Gilbert Abcarian, Political Implications of Art. *California* (Berkeley).

Fred Ablin, George Plekhanov and the "Iskra" Period. *Columbia.*

Minoo Adenwalla, Political Philosophy of the Indian National Movement. *Northwestern.*

Albert Alexander, Impact of U.S. on Revolutionary Ideas in Europe, 1830–1848. *New School.*

Moses J. Aronson, History of Legal Thought in America. *New School.*

Justin Atkinson, The Political Thought of L. T. Hobhouse. *California* (Berkeley).

Robert D. Barendsen, The Chinese Communist Germ Warfare Propaganda, 1952–1953. *Yale.*

---

* Similar lists have been printed in the REVIEW as follows: V, 456 (1911); VI, 464 (1912); VII, 689 (1913); VIII, 488 (1914); XIV, 155 (1920); XVI, 497 (1922); XIX, 171 (1925); XX, 660 (1926); XXI, 645 (1927); XXII, 736 (1928); XXIII, 795 (1929); XXIV, 799 (1930); XXV, 798 (1931); XXVI, 769 (1932); XXVII, 680 (1933); XXVIII, 766 (1934); XXIX, 713 (1935); XXX, 811 (1936); XXXI, 772 (1937); XXXII, 796 (1938); XXXIII, 732 (1939); XXXIV, 767 (1940); XXXV, 752 (1941); XXXVI, 734 (1942); XXXVII, 706 (1943); XXXVIII, 766 (1944); XXXIX, 779 (1945); XL, 775 (1946); XLI, 754 (1947); XLII, 759 (1948); XLIII, 787 (1949); XLIV, 689 (1950); XLV, 779 (1951); XLVI, 819 (1952); XLVII, 811 (1953); XLVIII, 793 (1954).

Items which appeared in the September, 1954 list are in general classified under the same headings in the present list, and new items have been assimilated to the 1954 classification as far as possible. In cases where classification of an item has been suggested by the institution concerned, the suggestion has been followed. Each item is listed under one classification only.

The lists printed in the REVIEW are based on information from departments giving graduate instruction in political science. Often dissertations are in progress in departments of economics, history, sociology, etc., which overlap or supplement dissertations in preparation in political science. Attention is called especially to the following lists: "Current Research Projects in Public Administration" (reported to Public Administration Service), the most recent edition of which appeared in 1951; "Doctoral Dissertations in Political Economy in Progress in American Colleges and Universities," in the *American Economic Review;* "List of Doctoral Dissertations in History Now in Progress," published annually by the Division of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution through 1938, and since then by the American Historical Association, as supplements to the *American Historical Review* (1940 and 1941), as Vol. III of its Annual Report (1941), and as separate publications (1947, 1949 and 1952); and "Doctoral Dissertations in Sociology," in the *American Journal of Sociology.* Consult also the "External Research List," published by the Office of Intelligence Research, Department of State. These are in addition to the "List of American Doctoral Dissertations Printed in 1938," the most recent of an annual series published by the Library of Congress; and Arnold H. Trotier and Marian Harman, "Doctoral Dissertations Accepted by American Universtities 1952–53," the twentieth of a series beginning in 1933–34, compiled for the Association of Research Libraries. Consult, for other lists, T. R. Palfrey and H. E. Coleman, Jr., "Guide to Bibliographies of Theses, United States and Canada" (Chicago, American Library Association, 2nd ed., 1940).

Abstracts of some of the theses listed as completed may be found in "Dissertation Abstracts," published bi-monthly by University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

† Prepared with the assistance of Miss Tania Chirikov.

Charles S. Bednar, Pragmatism: A Projected Metaphysics for a Democratic Society. *Columbia.*

Stanislaus Belch, Thomas Hobbes' Concept of Religion and the State's Relation to It. *Notre Dame.*

Laurence Berns, The Political Philosophy of Francis Bacon with Special Attention to the Principles of Foreign Policy. *Chicago.*

Samuel B. Bloom, Public Housing and Politics in Richmond, California. *California* (Berkeley).

William T. Bluhm, The Theory and Practice of Social Catholicism. *Chicago.*

Robert L. Bock, The Political Philosophy of Subhas Chandra Bose. *American.*

Wilmer L. Bohlmann, The Legal and Political Theories of Leon Duguit. *Washington* (Seattle).

George Brasington, Jr., Representative Government in Jacksonian Political Philosophy. *Illinois.*

William R. Brown, Deviations in American Communism: The Influence of American Politics and Economics on Communist Theory. *Washington* (St. Louis).

Francis P. Canavan, S.J., The Role of Reason in Politics: Burke and 18th Century Rationalism. *Duke.*

Francis M. Carney, Recent Development of the Concept of Representation in the United States. *California* (Los Angeles).

Vincent Chen, Chinese Communism: Mao Tse-Tung's Ideology. *Yale.*

Yung Ping Chen, Comparative Study of Dr. Sun Yat-sen's and Mao Tse-tung's Political Theories. *Maryland.*

Jules Cohn, The Political Theory of Lester Frank Ward. *Rutgers.*

Richard H. Cox, John Locke's Principles of Foreign Relations. *Chicago.*

Michael Raymond Curtis, The Theories of European Syndicalists. *Cornell.*

J. Raymond Derrig, S.J., Political Thought in American Catholic Newspapers. *St. Louis.*

Susan H. Devine, The Political and Social Philosophy of Herbert Hoover. *Pennsylvania.*

David M. Earl, Political Thinking in Maiji Japan. *Columbia.*

Harris I. Effross, The Political Philosophy of Herbert Croly. *Rutgers.*

Emily H. Ehle, The Identification of Local Leadership Within an American City (Philadelphia). *Pennsylvania.*

Arnett A. Elliott, Contemporary British Conservative Thought. *Columbia.*

Edward Fishman, The Political and Social Philosophy of Owen J. Roberts. *Pennsylvania.*

Martin Fleisher, Political Theory of James Harrington. *Columbia.*

Theodore B. Fleming, Jr., John Stuart Mill's Essay *On Liberty* and Its Critics. *Yale.*

Thomas A. Flinn, Croce, Collingwood and Cassirer, Their Concept of Method in the Study of Man and Application to Politics. *Minnesota.*

Richard D. Forster, The British Political Image of the United States. *Yale.*

Garland Fothergill, Some Elements in the Political Thought of John Dewey. *Minnesota.*

Julian Franklin, The Theory of Caesarism. *Columbia.*

Leonard Freedman, Group Opposition to Governmental Welfare Activities in the United States. *California* (Los Angeles).

Stanley T. Gabis, Secrecy in Politics: A Study in Attitudes. *Chicago.*

Robert L. Gaudino, Academic Freedom: An Inquiry into the Relations of University and State. *Chicago.*

Alexander L. George, The Intelligence Value of Content Analysis. *Chicago.*

R. Gordon Gilbert, Description and Prescription in Seventeenth Century Science. *California* (Berkeley).

Robert Goldwin, Property, Money and Justice: A Study of John Locke's Political Teachings. *Chicago.*

Robert C. Good, The Contribution of Reinhold Niebuhr to International Relations. *Yale.*

Peretz Gordon, The Political Thought and Action of David Ben-Gurion. *Chicago.*

Richard B. Gray, A Study of the Politics and Political Ideology of José J. Marti, the National Hero of the Cuban Republic. *Wisconsin.*

Gordon B. Greb, The Political Philosophy of the American Press. *Stanford.*

Andrew Hacker, Autonomy. *Princeton.*

Adele Haddad, The Concept of the State in Islamic Thought. *Michigan.*

Myron Q. Hale, American Conservatism: Conventionalism, Historicism, Functionalism. *Columbia.*

Joseph B. Hampton, The Political Theory of Existentialism in France. *Rutgers.*

Edward Handler, The Political Theory of John Adams: A Study of the Emergence of a Conservative Tradition in American Political Thought. *Harvard.*

Heber R. Harper, II, The Political Views of

Certain Contemporary Religious Fundamentalists. *Michigan.*

Beresford Hayward, An Evaluation of the Program of American Labor for a Full Employment Economy as an Efficient Expression of Its Contemporary Political Philosophy. *Chicago.*

Henry J. Hodder, The Political and Social Thought of Thorstein Veblen. *Harvard.*

David Holland, The Problematic Situation as a Context for Valuation in the Writings of John Dewey. *Harvard.*

Harry Holloway, T. H. Green and the Liberal Tradition. *Cornell.*

Richard L. Hough, The Jurisprudence of Learned Hand. *California* (Los Angeles).

Terry Hoy, Theories of the Exercise of Suffrage in the United States: A Critical Analysis. *California* (Berkeley).

D. Joy Humes, Oswald Garrison Villard. *Syracuse.*

George William Jaeger, The Political Philosophy of Irving Babbitt. *Harvard.*

James R. Jensen, Conservatism in Transition: The Socio-Economic Theories of *Fortune* and Its Editors (1930–1952). *Iowa.*

David Kettler, Adam Ferguson and the Scottish Historical School. *Columbia.*

John K. Knaus, The Political Philosophy of John Stuart Mill. *Stanford.*

Kwang Il Koh, The Political Theories and Practices of Syngman Rhee. *Rutgers.*

Irma Lang, Swiss Federalism: Theory and Structure. *Harvard.*

Guenter Lewy, The Political Philosophy of Juan de Mariana. *Columbia.*

John Logue, The Political Philosophy of Edward Hallatt Carr. *Chicago.*

Allen McConnell, Alexander Herzen and the Revolutions of 1848. *Brown.*

Thomas McEnroe, The Political Theory of American Syndicalism with Particular Reference to the I.W.W. *Minnesota.*

Brian A. McGrath, S.J., The Basic Political Philosophy of Woodrow Wilson. *Harvard.*

Donald McIntosh, Psychoanalysis and the Theory of Liberal Democracy. *Columbia.*

Maan Madina, Ijma: Public Consensus in Islam According to Al-Ghazali. *Chicago.*

Thomas F. Maher, Population and Politics: The Political Aspects of Birth Control. *Notre Dame.*

Cesar A. Majul, The Political Philosophy of the Philippine Revolution, 1896–1899. *Cornell.*

Serif A. Mardin, The Influence of Positivism on the Development of Turkish Political Thought in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. *Stanford.*

Lucian C. Marquis, The Political Thought of Protestant Churches and Sects in the United States, 1928–1953. *California* (Los Angeles).

Sylvester Massman, The Family in Political Modern Thought. *Minnesota.*

Nick A. Masters, An Analytical Study of the Political and Social Ideas of Father Charles E. Coughlin and the National Union of Social Justice. *Wisconsin.*

Ralph J. Mehr, H. J. Laski as a Marxist. *New School.*

James K. Melville, Brigham Young and American Political Ideas: An Analysis and Comparison. *Utah.*

David W. Minar, The Role of Public Opinion in Political Theories. *California* (Berkeley).

Robert K. Neary, Some Problems in Contemporary American Liberalism. *Southern California.*

Thomas Nedumgottil, The Theory of Revolution in Manabendra Nath Roy. *Notre Dame.*

Dorothy L. Noble, Francis Nicholson. *Columbia.*

Holtan P. Odegard, Approaches to a Theory of Administrative Democracy. *Wisconsin.*

Erma H. Olson, Democratic Theory and the Idea of the Managerial Revolution. *Minnesota.*

F. Oladipo Onipede, The Ideology of British Imperialism and Its Significance for Constitutional Development in Nigeria: A Study in Political and Legal Theory, 1850–1953. *Columbia.*

Ivan W. Parkins, John Dewey on Liberty. *Chicago.*

James H. Popham, Political Ideas in the American Novel, 1870–1910. *Princeton.*

Fred Raniele, Theories of Conscientious Objectors Toward War in the 16th and 17th Centuries. *Minnesota.*

David Rapoport, Theories of Change. *California* (Berkeley).

William O. Reichert, Recent American Conservatism. *Minnesota.*

John C. Rensenbrink, Liberty and Technology: An Appraisal Drawn from the Utopian Novels of Bellamy, Morris, Huxley, and Orwell. *Chicago.*

William A. Ritchie, A Critique of the Political Theory of Henry Sidgwick. *Michigan.*

Norman M. Rosenberg, The Grande Chartreuse: Studies in the Literature of Marxist Disenchantment. *Columbia.*

Esther Edelman Rowland, Political Theory of Ernest Jones. *Columbia.*

George Rozos, Development of the Concept of Property before Locke. *Columbia.*

Gene W. Setzer, Contemporary American Ideas of Human Equality. *Columbia.*

Marciarose Shestack, The Effect of Television on Political Campaigning. *Pennsylvania.*

Vance L. Shiflett, Jeremy Bentham: An Appraisal of his Political Ideas and Contributions to Legal Development. *Georgetown.*

Herbert P. Shyer, The Political Philosophy of David Hume. *Harvard.*

Donald E. Smith, The Political Philosophy of Jawaharlal Nehru. *Pennsylvania.*

Paul A. L. Smith, The Impact of International Events Upon Domestic Political Behavior. *Princeton.*

Stanislaw Staron, Public and Private Morality: A Study and Criticism of Some Selected Theories of their Inter-Relationships. *Minnesota.*

Robert F. Stephens, Political Theories Inherent in Selected Psychological Theories. *Michigan.*

Richard W. Sterling, Ego and Ethic in International Politics: Friedrich Meinecke and the Idea of Raison d'Etat. *Yale.*

William A. Stewart, The Political Ideas of L. T. Hobhouse. *Minnesota.*

Otto C. E. Stoetzer, The Influence of European Political Thought in Latin America (1789–1954). *Georgetown.*

Nathan M. Talbott, T'an Ssu-t'ung: Martyr of the 1898 Reform; The Intellectual Basis and Nature of His Political Ideas as Expressed in the Jen Hsueh. *Washington* (Seattle).

James Tierney, Political Theory of Bolingbroke and Halifax: A Comparative Study. *Brown.*

James E. Titus, Left of Center: A Study of American Liberalism in the 1930's. *Wisconsin.*

William F. Troutman, Theories of the Relationship between Church and State in America in the Period 1786–1791. *Duke.*

Vijayadevaraj Urs, The Problem of Compromise in Political Theory. *New School.*

Charles W. Van Cleve, The Doctrine of State and Church in Roman Catholic Thought in the Twentieth Century. *Texas.*

Jacob Vroom, Techniques of Evacuation—in Propaganda. *New School.*

David B. Walker, The Political Ideas of Rufus Choate. *Brown.*

George Weber, Church and State in France: A Study in the Manipulation of Liens upon Political Obedience. *Virginia.*

Nathan Weiss, The Political Theory of General Benjamin F. Butler—Practicing Politician. *New York University.*

Lloyd M. Wells, The Defense of Free Enterprise 1933–1953: A Study in the Political Thought of American Business Leaders and Their Spokesmen. *Princeton.*

Ruth L. Wishneff, Charles Péguy and the Crisis of the Third Republic. *Cornell.*

Noel I. Zinman, Fascist Thought in America. *New York University.*

GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS OF THE UNITED STATES AND ITS DEPENDENCIES

Myer Alpert, Public Policy and the Pulp and Paper Industry. *Harvard.*

Cleveland Anschell, Federal Aid for Highways. *Harvard.*

Charles H. Backstrom, The Progressive Party in Wisconsin, 1934–1946: An Analysis of a Modern American Third Party. *Wisconsin.*

David W. Barkley, Problems of the Aging Population and the Role of Government. *Harvard.*

David Bass, The Veto Power of the President: Its Theory and Practice. *Chicago.*

Robert L. Berg, Presidential Power and the Royal Prerogative. *Minnesota.*

Ray W. Bronez, Interest Groups and Public Housing. *Chicago.*

Edmund B. Brownell, A Study of the Interaction between the Department of the Treasury and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives. *Michigan.*

Edward M. Caine, The Regulation of Commercial Aviation under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. *New York University.*

Mark W. Cannon, Political Biography of George Q. Cannon, Political and Religious Leader in Utah from 1872–1901. *Harvard.*

King Carr, Collective Bargaining as a Public Campaign: Steel Industry, 1945–1949. *Chicago.*

William C. Carr, The Development of the Movement for Statehood in Utah, 1847–1896. *California* (Berkeley).

Charles L. Clapp, The Presidential Primary in 1952. *California* (Berkeley).

Omar A. Coleman, Inter-State Trade Barriers. *Washington* (Seattle).

Rudolph Swayne Comstock, The St. Lawrence Seaway Project. *Ohio State.*

Melvin Crain, Some Aspects of Representation in Alaska, 1912–1952. *Southern California.*

Paul B. Crooks, Farm Planning in Indiana. *Harvard.*

Alten Davis, Conflicts in Land Policy Between Federal and State Government. *California* (Berkeley).

James W. Davis, The Use and Effect of the Presidential Primary System. *Minnesota.*

John T. Dempsey, Control by Congress over the Seating and Disciplining of Its Members. *Michigan.*

Daniel F. DeNauw, O.S.B., A Study of Proposals for Home Rule for the District of Columbia. *Catholic University.*

William Dial, Instruments of Party Control in the United States Senate. *New York University.*

Martin Diamond, The Decline of the Socialist Party, U.S.A. *Chicago.*

Don Wallace Driggs, Executive-Legislative Relationships in American Foreign Policy, 1921–1933. *Harvard.*

Aurie N. Dunlap, The Political Career of Arthur H. Vandenberg. *Columbia.*

Nancy A. Edwards, Congress and Administrative Reorganization. *Columbia.*

William C. Ellet, Jr., Federal and State Control of Atomic Cities. *Michigan.*

Richard F. Fenno, Jr., The American Cabinet: An Analysis from Wilson to Truman. *Harvard.*

Jenniellen Ferguson, Voting Behavior for President in 600+ Counties in the United States, 1900–1950: A Statistical Study. *California* (Los Angeles).

Lewis P. Fickett, The Eisenhower Security Program: A Study in Public Policy. *Harvard.*

Jason L. Finkle, Congress and the Atomic Energy Program: A Study in Congressional Direction and Control. *Michigan.*

James J. Flannery, Water Pollution Control: Development of Public Policy and Federal-State Relations. *Wisconsin.*

George Foufas, American Party Platforms: 1940, 1944, 1948. *Harvard.*

Paul C. Fowler, Public Policy and Regulation of Radio and Television Broadcasting by the Federal Communications Commission. *Indiana.*

Gabriel Gabrelian, Voting Behavior in the United States. *Princeton.*

Franklin J. Gayles, Treason and "Cold War Treason." *New York University.*

William C. Gibbons, Congress and the International Information Program Since the End of World War II: A Case Study in the Intellectual Role of Congress in Foreign Policy Decision-Making. *Princeton.*

Charles E. Gilbert, Representation in Congress: A Case Study. *Northwestern.*

Betty Goetz, The Foreign Affairs Program of the League of Women Voters: Formulation, Mobilization of Public Opinion, Methods of Influencing Government Action, Evaluation of Results. *Minnesota.*

Antonio J. Gonzalez, Constitutional Development in Puerto Rico Since 1900. *Harvard.*

Lyman J. Gould, The Government of Puerto Rico: From Territory to Commonwealth. *Michigan.*

Gerald J. Grady, The St. Lawrence Waterway Controversies: A Study in Policy Formation. *Chicago.*

Charles J. Graham, Recent Republican Foreign Policy. *Illinois.*

Alice Greene, The Not So Supreme Court (The Supreme Court Fight of 1937). *Harvard.*

Harry Hall, Congressional Images of Scientists and Their Conception of Their Political Roles and Responsibilities. *Chicago.*

William D. Hatley, The Dixiecrat Movement. *Missouri.*

Donald E. Hayhurst, Consumer Welfare: Its Development as a National Governmental Function in Three Selected Agencies. *Pittsburgh.*

David Hazel, The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People: A Study in the Congressional Legislative Process. *Michigan.*

Marston Headley, Recent Developments in the Regulation of Railroad Consolidation. *Harvard.*

Richard B. Henderson, The Republican Party and the States' Rights Doctrine. *Maryland.*

Jack M. Hertzog, The Administration of Soldier Voting in the United States Army. *American.*

Donald C. Hester, Development of United States Participation in International Conferences. *Maryland.*

Edward Heubel, The Organization and Conduct of Congressional Investigations Since 1946. *Minnesota.*

Renze L. Hoeksema, United States Postwar Aid to the Philippines. *Harvard.*

Walter Hohenstein, Federal Control over Local and State Officers. *Minnesota.*

Frank Holloway, The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act before Congress: A Study in the Legislative Process. *Texas.*

Jack E. Holmes, Politics of National Farmers Union. *Chicago.*

James Howe, The Budget and Foreign Affairs. *Harvard.*

Robert M. Hunsaker, The Politics of Public Utilities. *Minnesota.*

Leigh Hunt, The "Kerr Bill" and National Regulation of the Independent Natural Gas Producers: A Case Study of the Political Process. *Minnesota.*

John E. Hutchinson, Labor and Health in America. *California* (Los Angeles).

Slater K. Isenberg, The Social Characteristics of Selected Areas of Non-Voting Concentration. *American.*

Fridolph Johnson, Limitations on the Scope of Presidential Power to Conclude International Agreements. *Michigan.*

Stanley Kelley, The Public Relations Counsel as Campaign Manager. *Johns Hopkins.*

Robert C. Kennedy, The Development of Labor Legislation in the Eightieth Congress (First Session). *American.*

Alan E. Kent, Wisconsin and Foreign Policy: Wisconsin's Senators and Representatives Since World War I. *Wisconsin.*

Charles F. Kiefer, The Secretary of Agriculture. *Harvard.*

Kenneth Kofmehl, Congressional Staffing, with Emphasis on the Professional Staff. *Columbia.*

Richard P. Kosaki, Political Beliefs in the Territory of Hawaii as Reflected in Legislative Sessions, with Special Reference to Racial and Cultural Influences. *Minnesota.*

Joseph L. Krieger, Executive Performance and Executive Success in Government. *American.*

Allen D. Krumm, A Study of the Political Status of the American Indian. *Utah.*

Richard E. Lambert, INCODEL, An Instrument of Interstate Governmental Cooperation. *Rutgers.*

Milton Levine, Reorganization Plans Submitted by the President to the 83rd Congress. *American.*

James R. Lewis, The Impact of Television on Political Conventions and Campaigns. *American.*

Joseph D. Lubin, The Item Veto and the Presidency. *California* (Berkeley).

Howard R. Ludden, Informational Activities of the Department of State: Historical Development and Present Organization and Operations. *Princeton.*

Thornton McClanahan, Organization of the Presidency for Fiscal Policy. *Harvard.*

David W. McCormick, Partisan Politics in a Middle-Sized Midwestern City: A Case Study of Rockford, Illinois. *Chicago.*

Charles A. McCoy, James Polk and the American Presidency. *Boston University.*

Charles B. Macklin, Land Grant Colleges and Public Policy. *Chicago.*

William B. Macomber, Jr., The Congressional Republicans and Organized Labor; 1926–1948. *Chicago.*

James M. Mahoney, The Irish Americans and Their Attitudes on Foreign Affairs. *Clark.*

Lewis Mainzer, Research Policy Formation Under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946. *Chicago.*

Kenneth K. Marcus, Federal Regulation of the Natural Gas Industry, 1945–1955. *Illinois.*

Elizabeth Marvick, The Study of Voting Behavior in Its Relation to the Theory of Political Democracy. *Columbia.*

David R. Matthis, The National Committee in American Organization. *Texas.*

Norman Meller, Centralization and Integration in Hawaii. *Chicago.*

Frank S. Mellor, Employment of Civilians by the Department of the Army: Factors in Determining Whether Military or Civilian Personnel Should Be Assigned to Particular Activities or Jobs. *Harvard.*

Karl E. Meyer, "Americanism" in Wisconsin Politics 1917–1952. *Princeton.*

Leno C. Michelon, Post-War Conceptions of Managerial Responsibility in Labor Relations. *Chicago.*

John H. Michener, The United States Cabinet: A Study of Proposed Modifications, with Especial Reference to Cabinet-Congressional Relations. *California* (Berkeley).

Clifford Miller, Institutional Considerations in the Formulation of Federal Fiscal Policy. *American.*

Don Muchmore, Political Use of the Presidential Appointive Power, 1900–1950. *California* (Los Angeles).

Robert Lee Munkres, Congressional Attempts to Influence Foreign Policy. *Nebraska.*

Arthur W. Murphy, Communist Penetration of the United States Maritime Industry. *Georgetown.*

Robert Henry Myers, The Dual Federalism of American Banking. *Chicago.*

Henry Nash, The Selection of the United States Ambassadors to the Soviet Union. *New York University.*

Edward R. Padgett, The Minority Party in Bi-Partisan Foreign Policy Formulation in the United States. *Maryland.*

A. Edward Patmos, Some Recent Attempts of

Non-Political Organizations to Influence Federal Legislation. *New York University.*

Stewart M. Patterson, The Role of Executive Agreements in the Execution of U.S. Foreign Policy. *American.*

Arthur Peterson, McCarthyism: Its Foundation and Ideology. *Minnesota.*

Walfrid Peterson, The Foreign Policy of American Third Parties. *Minnesota.*

Denis Philipps, Americans and Compulsory Military Service: A Study of Changing Public Policy with Particular Reference to the Period 1940–1951. *New York University.*

Robert J. Pitchell, The Pattern of Voting Behavior in California, 1922–1952. *California* (Berkeley).

Theodore Powell, The President's Ear: Policy-Making and Policy-Makers in the Truman Administration. *Columbia.*

John R. Probert, The National Security Act of 1947. *Pennsylvania.*

Edward W. Proxmire, The Limitations and Possibilities of Increasing Public Understanding of National Politics through the Daily Newspaper. *Harvard.*

Michael Reagan, Congressional Mind and Military Foreign Policy. *Princeton.*

Norman F. Reber, Main Factors That Determine the Editorial Content of Farm Magazines As It Relates to Influence on Public Opinion. *Pennsylvania.*

Merton L. Reichler, Disintegration and Insurgency in the Democratic Party in New York County. *Columbia.*

Ross R. Rice, The Politics of Missouri Valley Development. *Chicago.*

Donald H. Riddle, The Truman Committee: A Study in Congressional Control of the Military. *Princeton.*

James W. Riddlesperger, Alexander Hamilton and the Modern American Constitution. *Texas.*

James N. Rosenau, The Senate and Dean Acheson, 1949–52. *Princeton.*

Robert M. Rosenzweig, The Meaning and Significance of Involvement in a Political Campaign. *Yale.*

Harold I. Roth, Collective Bargaining Patterns in the Motion Picture Industry. *Chicago.*

Lloyd I. Rudolph, American Politics 1787–1800: A Study in the Origin of Party. *Harvard.*

Martha L. Saenger, The 1944 Presidential Campaign: An Analysis of the Forces behind the Pro-Roosevelt CIO Political Action Committee. *Ohio State.*

Warren D. St. James, The NAACP: Its Organization and Methods. *St. Louis.*

Carl Santoro, A New Approach to the Problem of Non-Voting. *Pennsylvania.*

O. Glenn Saxon, Jr., The Policies and Attitudes of the American Federation of Musicians on Technological Advance. *Columbia.*

Peter P. Schauffler, The History and Potentialities of the Legislative Veto Device in the Federal Government. *Harvard.*

Paul J. Scheips, The Chiriqui Improvement Company: An Experiment in American Economic Expansion. *American.*

Seymour Scher, The Bifurcation of the National Labor Relations Board. *Chicago.*

Harry M. Scoble, Jr., Yankeetown: A Study of Community Decision-Making Processes. *Yale.*

Kenneth E. Scott, Marshall Plan and Executive Decision Making. *Princeton.*

Jackson W. Selman, The Problem of Amending the Constitutional Provisions for Electing the President, 1787–1950. *North Carolina.*

Gordon Shull, The Presbyterian Church in American Politics: A Study in Contemporary Church-State Relations. *Illinois.*

Morris Simon, Woodrow Wilson and the Legislative Process. *Cornell.*

Franklin Smallwood, Advisory Group Activity in the Atomic Energy Program. *Harvard.*

Isidore Starr, Proposals for the Reform of the American Anti-Trust Laws. *New School.*

Leonard Stein, Labor and Politics: An Inventory of Research. *Chicago.*

Robert C. Stender, The Defense Budgetary Process. *Harvard.*

Oscar Stradinger, The Bureau of Reclamation: A Study in Administrative Organization and Techniques as These Influence and Are Influenced by Policy Positions. *Chicago.*

Anthony Y.S. Szu-tu, Legal Status of Chinese in the United States. *New York University.*

Harris E. Thurber, The Vermont Judiciary: A Study in Cultural Adaptation. *Princeton*

Paul D. Tillett, The Cancellation of Air Mail Contracts: 1934. *Princeton.*

Henry Tomasek, The Great Plains Agricultural Council. *Chicago.*

Daniel W. Tuttle, Intergovernmental Relations in Wyoming Land Policy and Administration. *Minnesota.*

Robert A. Wallace, Congressional Control of Federal Expenditures. *Chicago.*

Herbert Waltzer, A History and Analysis of Federal Corrupt Practices Legislation. *New York University.*

Andrew J. Wann, Franklin D. Roosevelt: A Study of Leadership. *Missouri.*

Leo Weinstein, The Place of Lobbying in the Legislative Process. *Chicago.*

Warren Weston, A Comparison of the Method of Filling Vacancies in Congress by Appointment and by Special Election. *Minnesota.*

Oliver P. Williams, The Political Environment of the Commodity Credit Corporation with Special Reference to the Grain Storage Issues of the 1948 Presidential Campaign. *Chicago.*

William W. Young, Congressional Investigations of the Federal Administration. *California* (Berkeley).

Vytautas S. Zvirzdys, Select Committees of Congress in Foreign Relations: A Case Study in Legislative Process. *Wisconsin.*

CONSTITUTIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE LAW IN THE UNITED STATES

Roscoe C. Adkins, Justice Brandeis and Administrative Law. *Texas.*

George R. Blackburn, Freedom of Association: The Group versus the Individual before the Courts. *Harvard.*

Ruth L. Byrd, Justice Rufus Wheeler Peckham and the Growth of Capitalism in the United States. *American.*

Gordon B. Cleveland, The Role of the Rule of Law in the Administrative State; with Special Emphasis on Civil Liberties. *North Carolina.*

Fredryc R. Darby, The Constitutionality of Anti-miscegenation Laws under the 14th Amendment. *California* (Berkeley).

Emily Dawson, The Supreme Court's Conception of Religious Liberty in the Jehovah's Witnesses' Cases. *Minnesota.*

Rondal G. Downing, The Federal Courts and National Labor Relations, 1953–1955; A Study of Judicial Policy Formation. *Illinois.*

Christopher Dyer-Bennet, Justice Harlan and the Federal System. *California* (Berkeley).

Dorothy Fields, Mr. Justice Murphy. *Columbia.*

Spencer Gervin, The Development of Rule by Decree in American Constitutional Law. *Duke.*

Royal C. Gilkey, Mr. Justice Frankfurter and Civil Liberties. *Minnesota.*

Ernest R. Griffin, The Full Faith and Credit Clause as Applied to Divorce Decrees. *Duke.*

Luther Hagard, The Equality of the States in the United States: Theory, Constitutional Law and Practice. *Minnesota.*

Heinz R. Hink, Some Aspects of Public Liability for Torts of Officers in Anglo-American and Continental Law. *Washington* (Seattle).

Charles A. Hollister, A Judicial Analysis of the Right to Acquire, Possess and Protect Property in Pennsylvania. *Pennsylvania.*

John W. Hopkirk, William O. Douglas, Individualist. *Princeton.*

James A. Killough, Federal Regulation of Economic Aspects of Air Carriers: A Study of Civil Aeronautics Board Policies Enforcing the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as Amended, Emphasizing Certificates of Public Convenience, Permits to Foreign Carriers and Rate-Making Practices. *Pennsylvania.*

John T. Kitos, Coordination of Public Health and Hospital Administration in New York State. *Syracuse.*

James R. Klonoski, The Influence of Government Counsel on Supreme Court Decisions Involving the Commerce Power. *Michigan.*

Jacob Kossman, Constitutional Rights of a Defendant in Federal Criminal Proceedings. *Pennsylvania.*

Oscar Kraines, Ernst Freund's Contribution to American Legal Thought. *New York University.*

Sam Krislov, The Supreme Court Since 1937—Nine Judges in Search of a Role. *Princeton.*

Roseana Kronick, The Power of the President to Remove Officials with Emphasis upon Officials Exercising Quasi-Judicial and Quasi-Legislative Functions. *California* (Berkeley).

J. T. Law, The Constitutional Ideas of Mr. Justice Horace Gray. *Wisconsin.*

Harold J. Leu, Some Constitutional Aspects of the Extra-Continental Jurisdiction of the United States. *Michigan.*

Eleanor T. Linenthal, Free Speech and the Power of the Courts and Congress to Punish for Contempt. *Cornell.*

Theodore V. Liss, The Genesis and Development of the Concept of the Free Flow of Commerce. *Michigan.*

Lewis I. Maddocks, The Dissenting Opinions of Justice Harlan. *Ohio State.*

John M. Martin, Jr., Robert H. Jackson, Associate Justice of the United States. *Johns Hopkins.*

Eugene A. Mawhinney, The Development of the Concept of Liberty in the Fourteenth Amendment. *Illinois.*

Ernest E. Means, Free Speech v. Fair Trial. *Wisconsin.*

Lyndon R. Musolf, Water Law in the Western States and Federal Control and Development of Water Resources. *California* (Los Angeles).

Harding C. Noblitt, The Supreme Court and the Progressive Era, 1902–1921. *Chicago.*

William O'Brien, S.J., Justice Reed and the First Amendment Liberties. *Georgetown.*

Eugene S. Powell, Limits on the King's Prerogative: The Colonial Background to Substantive Due Process of Law. *California* (Berkeley).

Earl A. Radley, Mr. Justice Frankfurter's Conception of the Role of the Supreme Court in the American Federal System. *Harvard.*

Charles M. Rehmus, Executive Powers in National Emergency Labor Disputes. *Stanford.*

Yosal Rogat, Political Theory and Judicial Review: A Study of the Thought of Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. *California* (Berkeley).

Eva Rubin, The Supreme Court at Mid-Century: A Study of Judicial Self-Limitation. *Johns Hopkins.*

Robert Runo, Law Making by the Roosevelt Court: A Study in Methods of Statutory Interpretation. *Chicago.*

Alan Silverman, Mr. Justice Douglas and Civil Liberties. *Columbia.*

L. Dean Sprague, Civil Rights During War. *Syracuse.*

Robert J. Steamer, The Constitutional Doctrines of Mr. Justice Robert H. Jackson. *Cornell.*

Raymond P. Stone, Separate but Equal: A Study in the Formulation and Modification of a Constitutional Doctrine. *Princeton.*

Hobert P. Sturm, The Legal Theory of Associate Justice David J. Brewer. *Utah.*

Bertrand Clinton Trautman, Natural Law Concept Found in Supreme Court Decisions. *Harvard.*

Kenneth W. Treacy, Aspects of the Commerce Clause. *Utah.*

William Welsh, The Local Regulation of Minimum Housing Standards in Selected Cities Throughout the United States. *Syracuse.*

Warren C. White, Rulemaking Procedures in the Interstate Commerce Commission. *Maryland.*

Stephen B. Wood, Child Labor and the Constitution. *Chicago.*

AMERICAN STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Frank C. Abbott, State Organization and Administration of Tax-Supported Higher Education. *Harvard.*

Sylvester S. Aichele, Pressure Groups and the Legislative Process in Pennsylvania. *Pennsylvania.*

Dee Akers, Procedures of Regulatory Administration in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. *Kentucky.*

James Kress Anderson, Inter-Relation of Governmental Jurisdictions within the State of New York. *New School.*

Eva Aronfreed, City of Philadelphia Public Relations Department. *Pennsylvania.*

Chester W. Bain, Readjustment of City and County Boundaries in Virginia. *Virginia.*

Richard N. Baisden, Los Angeles Labor and the Los Angeles City Government. *Chicago.*

John T. Ballard, Integration of County Offices in Iowa. *Iowa.*

Emmett W. Bashful, The Florida Supreme Court: A Study in Judicial Selection. *Illinois.*

Kenneth E. Beasley, Municipal Debt Limitation and Control in Kansas. *Kansas.*

Jewel Bellush, Herbert H. Lehman, Lt. Governor and Governor: A Study in State Leadership, 1928–1942. *Columbia.*

Joseph Bernd, The Voting Behavior of the Georgia Precincts in Statewide Elections, 1946–1954. *Duke.*

Wallace H. Best, Initiative and Referendum Politics in California, 1912–1952. *Southern California.*

William E. Biggs, The Handling of Workmen's Compensation Claims by the Ohio Industrial Commission: 1940–1955. *Ohio State.*

Joe H. Bindley, Voting Behavior in Ohio, 1924–1950: An Analytical Study. *California* (Los Angeles).

Lemuel F. Blitz, The Involvement of Local Governments in Metropolitan Problems in the Norfolk, Virginia, Area. *North Carolina.*

William J. Block, The Separation of the Farm Bureau and the Extension Service: A Study of Group Activities. *Illinois.*

Donald E. Boles, Conservation and the Administrative Process in Wisconsin. *Wisconsin.*

John A. Bond, Legislative Reapportionment in Minnesota. *Minnesota.*

Morton Broffman, Executive Office of the Mayor of New York City. *Harvard.*

Claude J. Burtenshaw, State Regulation of

Insurance Since the S.E. Fire Underwriters' Case. *Utah.*

Warren I. Cikens, Case Study of Alabama Power Company and TVA in Power Resource Development. *Harvard.*

Robert L. Clark, State Administrative Supervision over Local Government, West Virginia. *Illinois.*

Alexander Cloner, The Role of the Executive in Local Public Housing Authorities in the United States of America. *Southern California.*

James Coke, State Imposition on the Local Governments of Minnesota of Personnel Standards for Aided Functions. *Minnesota.*

James T. Crown, The Development of Democratic Government in New York State through the Growth of the Power of the Governor since 1920. *New York University.*

Charles C. Curran, The Health Function on the Local Level: Kansas City, Missouri—An Administrative Case Study. *Harvard.*

Ira Ridgway Davis, Party and Voting Behavior in the Portsmouth Atomic Energy Establishment Area. *Ohio State.*

Thomas J. Davy, State Administered In-Service Training Programs for Municipal Officials under the George-Deen Act, with Special Reference to Pennsylvania. *Pennsylvania.*

David R. Derge, The Power Position of the Chicago Legislative Delegation in the Illinois General Assembly. *Northwestern.*

Carl E. DeVane, Administrative Problems in the Public Budgetary Process, with Special Reference to the City of Philadelphia. *Pennsylvania.*

Stanley E. Dewey, The Portsmouth Area of the AEC: Its Impact on Local Government (With Special Reference to Intergovernmental Relations). *Ohio State.*

Brock Dixon, The Problem of Local Government in the Metropolitan Area of Portland, Oregon. *Southern California.*

Manuel Dobrusin, Proportional Representation in Massachusetts: The Success of Seven Massachusetts Municipalities with the Proportional Representation Method of Voting. *Boston University.*

Douglas J. Doubleday, Legislative Review of the Budget in California. *California* (Berkeley).

Paul M. Douglas, Administrative Reorganization in New Jersey. *Princeton.*

John H. Duke, The Role of California County Committeemen in Party Politics. *Southern California.*

Gerald E. Dunn, State Courts and the Administration of Federal Law. *Johns Hopkins.*

George Elcaness, A History of the Consolidation of the City of New York. *New York University.*

Thomas A. Flinn, Governor and Legislature: A Case Study in Political Decision-Making. *Minnesota.*

Floyd O. Flom, The Legislative Process: A Case Study, With Emphasis on the Rule of the Individual. *Minnesota.*

Houston I. Flournoy, The Liberal Party in New York State. *Princeton.*

Roy E. Fossett, Governor E. D. Rivers: The New Deal Comes to Georgia. *Florida.*

Herbert Garfinkel, F.E.P.C. Legislation in Illinois. *Chicago.*

Louise B. Gerrard, Newspapers and Politics: Proportional Representation in New York City. *Columbia.*

Israel Glasser, An Analysis of Differential Voting Participation in the 1953 Democratic Mayoralty Primary Election in New York City. *New York University.*

Gibson Gray, A Political Education for the New Reformers: A Study of the Evolution of the Movement for Fair Employment Legislation in Pennsylvania from 1945 to 1951. *Columbia.*

G. Phillips Hanna, New Hampshire Politics: A Case Study of the Recruitment of Political Leaders. *Princeton.*

Lyle M. Hansen, A Case Study in Selected Aspects of the Role of City Councilmen. *Syracuse.*

Marvin A. Harder, The Democratic Party in Kansas: A Case Study of the Role of a Minority Party in a One-Party State. *Columbia.*

Leroy C. Hardy, Reapportionment in California, 1951: A Political Analysis. *California* (Los Angeles).

Louise Harned, Participation in Political Parties: A Study of Party Committeemen. *Yale.*

Frederick H. Harris, Jr., A Study of Political Activity in Two North Carolina Counties. *North Carolina.*

James B. Harrison, Democratic Party of Oregon. *Washington* (Seattle).

Richard B. Harvey, The Governorship of Earl Warren in Relation to the Development of the Republican Party in California. *California* (Los Angeles).

Donald B. Hayman, Social Security and State and Local Retirement in North Carolina. *North Carolina.*

Allan Healey, An Analytical History of the Power of Political Parties in Illinois, 1928–1948. *Chicago.*

Clarence J. Hein, The Operation of the Direct Primary in Minnesota. *Minnesota.*

A. Freeman Holmer, The Executive Budget in Oregon. *Columbia.*

McCown E. Hunt, Political and Technical Aspects of the Utilization of Ground Water in the State of Utah. *Utah.*

Page L. Ingraham, Politics of Agriculture in Minnesota, 1930–1950. *Chicago.*

William P. Irwin, Political Behavior Trends in Colorado. *California* (Berkeley).

Evan A. Iverson, Politics and Administration of Water Resources in the West with Special Attention to the Colorado River Basin. *Utah.*

James A. Jarvis, Intergovernmental Relationships of Louisville, Kentucky, with Special Reference to Public Housing. *Illinois.*

Eugene W. Jones, The Employment Security Commission in North Carolina. *North Carolina.*

Conrad Joyner, The Ku Klux Klan in Indiana Politics. *Florida.*

Robert Kelsey, Southern Neo-Populism of the 1920's. *Florida.*

Gertrude Lamb, Administration of State Grants-In-Aid. *Boston University.*

John A. Larson, Jr., Community Participation in Tennessee's Postwar Industrial Development. *Northwestern.*

Hugh LeBlanc, The Political Process in the District of Columbia. *Chicago.*

Eugene Lee, Non-Partisan Local Government in California. *California* (Berkeley).

Ellis E. McCune, Jury Selection in California: A Study in Judicial Administration. *California* (Los Angeles).

Hugh MacNiven, Payments in Lieu of Taxes and Payments to School Districts in Defense Impacted Areas of Minnesota. *Minnesota.*

Arthur C. Marlow, The Executive Budget in Missouri. *St. Louis.*

Thomas R. Masterson, The Chicago Regional Port District. *Chicago.*

Lois B. Merk, Massachusetts in the Woman Suffrage Movement. *Harvard.*

Warner Mills, Jr., Ross Sterling, Governor of Texas. *Johns Hopkins.*

John C. Murray, The Development of the Executive Branch of Government in Rhode Island. *Brown.*

Earl A. Nehring, A Study of Political Leadership in Four Cities in Los Angeles County Having the Council-Manager Form of Government. *California* (Los Angeles).

Isham G. Newton, A Survey of the Minor Judiciary of North Carolina, with Special Emphasis on the Justice of the Peace. *Pennsylvania.*

Walter H. Niehoff, Democratic Trends in the Constitutions of Pennsylvania. *Pennsylvania State*

James Nietmann, The Administration of Government in the City of St. Louis, Missouri, 1875–1950. *Harvard.*

Benjamin Nispel, The Office of the Lieutenant Governor in the United States. *Pennsylvania.*

Sally Joy Oleon, David L. Lawrence, Mayor of Pittsburgh: Politics and Public Service. *Pittsburgh.*

Garfield S. Pancoast, The Second Class Township in Pennsylvania. *Pennsylvania.*

Daisy Parker, The Executive Department of the State of Florida. *Virginia.*

Dorothy S. Pealy, An Evaluation of the Work of the Ann Arbor Home Rule Charter Commission. *Michigan.*

Philip C. Pendleton, A Critical Analysis of the Effectiveness of the Municipal Leagues of Pennsylvania. *Pennsylvania.*

Frank Peters, The Colonial Governor of Delaware. *Duke.*

Dwynal B. Pettengill, Financing Political Parties in Maryland. *Johns Hopkins.*

Theodore P. Pidus, The Role of Local Governments in Combatting Communism. *Pennsylvania.*

Leo F. Redfern, Fiscal Control of State Universities. *Harvard.*

Adolph Reed, The Decline of the American Labor Party in New York City. *American.*

Samuel J. Resnick, The City Planning Commission and the Department of City Planning of the City of New York. *New York University.*

Herbert Rosenbaum, The Dynamics of Parties and Politics in the Expanding Suburb: A Case Study of Nassau County, New York. *Columbia.*

Leonard C. Rowe, The Problem of Money in Elections in California. *California* (Berkeley)

Wesley A. St. John, The Issuance, Suspension and Revocation of Occupational and Professional Licenses—A Study of California Administrative Procedure. *California* (Berkeley)

Robert L. Sawyer, Jr., The Regulation and Control of Subversive Activities in Michigan. *Michigan.*

Joseph A. Schlesinger, Methods of Ascendancy to the Office of Governor in the United States. *Yale.*

Edgar L. Sherbenou, The Structure and Method of Political Power in a Small Town. *Kansas.*

Gerard H. Siverburgh, Fusion Reform in New York City, 1933–1934. *Columbia.*

Frederick C. Spiegel, The Liability of the American State with Special Reference to Illinois. *Illinois.*

Israel Stiefel, Reorganization of the Pennsylvania State Administrative Structure. *Pennsylvania.*

John O. Stitely, The Rhode Island General Assembly. *Harvard.*

Marvin Tableman, City-State Fiscal Relations in Michigan, 1937–1947. *Michigan.*

James D. Thomas, Jr., County Government and Administration in Alabama. *Ohio State.*

William C. Thomas, Jr., A Study of the Bureau Chiefs of the City of New York. *Columbia.*

Donald S. Vaughan, Administrative Responsibility in Alabama. *Columbia.*

John E. Westburg, Constitutional Reforms for Effective Government in Nevada. *Southern California.*

John Wheeler, State-Local Relationships in Vermont. *Syracuse.*

George D. Wilson, The Politics of Governmental Integration in the Atlanta Metropolitan Area. *North Carolina.*

William C. Wimberly, The Illinois Primary. *Illinois.*

Frederick M. Wirt, State Motion Picture Censorship: A Study in Freedom and Power. *Ohio State.*

Lloyd Woodruff, County Boards in Wisconsin. *Minnesota.*

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Milton C. Abrams, Emergence of Administrative Structure in the Period of the Great Commanders, 1630–1800. *Utah.*

Sidney Baldwin, The Farm Security Administration: A Study in Politics and Administration. *Syracuse.*

Norman Beckman, Federal-State Relations in Public Health: A Study of the Non-Fiscal and Non-Regulatory Techniques of the Bureau of State Services. *Columbia.*

William J. Bell, A Reexamination of Bureaucracy. *Indiana.*

Eugenie K. Bigelow, Role of Advisory Bodies in the Foreign Service. *Pennsylvania.*

Kenneth P. Borgen, Development of Budget Policy for the Department of Defense. *American.*

Calvin G. Brooks, Administration of an Extended Social Security System in the United States. *American.*

Milan L. Brown, Personnel Policies and Practices in Federal Administration: A Critique of Personnel Management in Selected Federal Agencies. *Pennsylvania.*

Andrew S. Bullis, Jr., Fiscal Administration in Selected Pennsylvania Cities. *Syracuse.*

Frederick O. Bundy, The Administration of Rule Making and Licensing Processes under Selected Statutes of the Department of Agriculture. *Syracuse.*

Charles E. Campbell, Current Executive Development Programs in the United States Army and Air Force with an Appraisal of Selected American Industrial Training Procedures. *American.*

John M. Capozzola, The New York Regional Office of the N.L.R.B.: Organization, Policies and Procedures. *Pennsylvania.*

Daniel T. Carroll, The Development of the Appeals System in the Federal Civil Service. *Chicago.*

Edwin L. Cling, Unionization of the City Government of Milwaukee, with Particular Reference to Unions wtih Membership Primarily in Private Industry. *Northwestern.*

Wallace C. Clopton, The Budget Division of Connecticut as a Staff Agency. *Yale.*

Robert J. Courtney, The Manager Plan in Pennsylvania Local Government. *Pennsylvania.*

Roderick K. deCamp, The Chicago Transit Authority: A Study in Responsibility. *Chicago.*

Russell E. Dybdahl, The Administration of Professional Licenses in Iowa. *Iowa.*

Eugene T. Ferraro, The Aircraft Spare Parts Industry in the United States: A Case Study in New Administrative Problems of Big Government. *New School.*

Harold E. Finnegan, Quantitative Measures of Manpower Management and an Interpretation of Their Application in a Large Federal Mental Hospital. *American.*

Thomas S. Francis, An Analysis of the Organization and Operation of Privately Sponsored Commissions of Inquiry. *Columbia.*

Emanuel R. Fuchs, Federal-State Relations in River Basin Development: A Case Study of the Missouri Valley. *Harvard.*

David R. Gardner, The Coordination of Federal, Regional, State and Local Agencies in the

Preparation of Detailed Soil Survey Reports. *Harvard.*

Reverdy T. Gliddon, Regulation of the Air Route Pattern by the Civil Aeronautics Board. *Texas.*

Paul Gordon, Evaluation of Top Management and Organization in Hospitals. *Syracuse.*

Clifford R. Gross, The Budgetary Administration of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, *Syracuse.*

John M. Hale, Development of the Atomic Energy Commission Personnel System as Compared to Regular Departmental Personnel Systems. *Michigan.*

Clyde T. Hardwick, Cooperative Purchasing Techniques for Municipalities. *Michigan.*

John Hebal, Field Administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Minnesota and Wisconsin. *Minnesota.*

Edward L. Henry, A Politico-Administrative Appraisal of Government Organization for Monetary Policy. *Chicago.*

Robert S. Herman, Revenue Estimating in New York State Government. *New York University.*

Donald S. Hiller, The Commission Plan of City Government in Pennsylvania. *Pennsylvania.*

Victor C. Hobday, Tennessee Municipalities and TVA Electric Power. *Syracuse.*

Walter W. Hodgson, Health Administration in the Philadelphia Metropolitan Area. *Pennsylvania*

Barrett Hollister, Natural Resources Administration in Ohio. *Syracuse.*

Erin Hubbert, William Ashby Jump, Public Administrator. *Syracuse.*

Clyde W. Humphrey, Organizing and Administering Vocational Business Training in Public Educational Agencies. *American.*

Albert P. Ingraham, Situational Factors in Federal Government Executive Positions and Their Relation to Executive Selection and Development. *American.*

Penrose Jackson, Personnel of Selected Federal Regulatory Commissions. *Texas.*

Judith N. Jamison, Administrative Reforms of the Hiram Johnson Era in California. *California* (Los Angeles).

Holman W. Jenkins, The American Philosophy of War: An Inquiry into Sources and Principles Governing the Strategic Concepts of the Armed Forces of the United States Since World War II. *Pennsylvania.*

Robert V. Kirch, Administrative Regulation of a Public Utility: A Case Study. *Indiana.*

Robert L. Kline, The Administration of Federal Migratory Waterfowl Legislation, *Iowa.*

Anna Knoll, The Problem of Training Career Administrators. *American.*

Gerhard J. Kruger, Position Classification and Employment Policies in the Department of Agriculture from 1914 to the Present Time. *American.*

Walter Kurylo, A Study of the Federal-Aid Highway Program with Special Emphasis on Its Budgetary and Planning Aspects. *American.*

Ezra Lander, Performance Budgeting and Accounting Policy in the Department of the Army. *American*

William Larsen, The Field Service of the United States Bureau of the Budget. *California* (Berkeley).

George R. Long, The Administration of Virginia State Highways. *Virginia.*

William H. Ludlow, Government Control of Urban Population Densities. *Chicago.*

Conrad L. McBride, State Policy and Administration of Conservation of Natural Resources. *California* (Los Angeles).

John P. McCarthy, Legislative-Executive Relations: Federal Organization. *Chicago.*

Richard H. McCleery, Institutional Change: A Case Study of Prison Management in Transition, 1945–1955. *North Carolina.*

Donald E. J. MacNamara, The Administrative Organization and Operation of Provost Marshal General Activities in World War II. *Columbia.*

Donald R. MacQuivey, Frequency Assignment in Administrative Control. *American.*

Byron S. Martin, Planning for Total Mobilization for War in the United States: 1920–1940. *Chicago.*

Charles Miller, II, The Administrative Feasibility of Including Domestic Servants Under the Federal Old Age and Survivors Insurance Program. *Pennsylvania.*

William B. Monat, A Critical Analysis of the Merit System in Minnesota. *Minnesota.*

Chester Morrill, Jr., Organizational Principles Applied to the Lower Echelons of the United States Army. *American.*

Dennis E. Mulvihill, An Appraisal of the Army Ordnance Management Improvement Program. *Pittsburgh.*

Mildred E. Negus. A Study of the Unit Cost of a Tax Supported Public Health Nursing Service, with Special Reference to the District of Columbia. *American.*

James E. Nix, The Admission of Negroes to State Universities in the South. *Syracuse.*

William C. Nolan, Organization for the Regulation of Trade—The Federal Trade Commission from Humphrey to the Basing Point Decisions. *New York University.*

Robert M. Northrop, Administrative Doctrine and Administrative Behavior: The AEC Experience. *Michigan.*

Leavy Oliver, Progress of Negroes in the Public Service. *Indiana.*

Benjamin L. Olsen, Administrative Aspects of Water Resource Development in California. *Stanford.*

Arthur S. Patrick, An Analysis of the Duties and Responsibilities of the First-Line Office Supervisor in Government. *American.*

Robert H. Pealy, A Comparative Study of Property Tax Administration in Illinois and Michigan. *Michigan.*

Ben Posner, Accounting Data as Related to Performance Budgeting in the Federal Government. *American.*

Robert W. Powers, Interagency Cooperation in Foreign Technical Assistance Programs. *Minnesota.*

Nathaniel S. Preston, The Use and Control of Public Authorities in the United States: A Study of the Public Corporation on the State, Local and Regional Levels. *Princeton.*

William M. Ransom. The Reorganization of Public Health Administration in the State of Iowa. *Iowa.*

Lee B. Reifel, Limitations and Potentialities of Democratic Administration in Colleges and Universities in the United States. *American.*

Vorley Rexroad, The Administration of the Los Alamos Atomic Energy Project. *New York University.*

Leo Richards, Budgeting in the National Housing Agency. *American.*

Herbert Rosenberg, Office of Defense Mobilization: A Study of Civil-Military Relations During the Korean Mobilization. *Chicago.*

Arthur H. Rosien, The Administrative Relationship between the Army and the Territory of Alaska. *Syracuse.*

Harold H. Roth, The Executive Office of the President: Its Development as an Administrative Instrument. *American.*

Liberata B. Ruscigno, Organization for Personnel Management in California. *Stanford.*

Harry Seymour, Organization and Administration of the Bureau of Naval Personnel. *Syracuse.*

William Shore, Doctrine of Governmental Liability and Its Impact Upon Public Administration. *Syracuse.*

Bernard E. Shultz. The Federal Occupational Classification Structure under the Classification Act of 1949. *American.*

William J. Siffin, Government and the Cotton Problem. *Harvard.*

Palmer R. Sime, Farm Planning in the Soil Conservation Service. *Harvard.*

Alfred M. Skolnik, The Role of Government in Providing Cash Benefits for Temporary Disability. *American.*

Elizabeth B. Smith, Intergovernmental Relations in Public Health Administration: A Study of the Adaptation and Execution of Public Policy. *Virginia.*

Sidney Spector, Public Administration Among Primitive Societies. *Chicago.*

Russell P. Strange, Personnel Administration in the Department of Defense: Theory and Practice. *Maryland.*

David L. Stratmon, The United States Public Health Mission to Liberia, 1944–1952: An Apprasial. *Michigan.*

Richard Stuart, Financing Capital Improvements in Maine. *Pennsylvania.*

Frank W. Suggitt, Area Analysis—The Educational Function in Program Adaptation. *Harvard.*

Arnols E. Sukrow, Qualifications of Federal Personnel Techniques. *American.*

Nelson E. Taylor, Jr., The Association of American Railroads—Its Role as a Pressure Group. *Harvard.*

T. F. Thompson, Responsibility of School Teachers as Public Servants. *Indiana.*

William Thorkelson, Planning and Programming in the Armed Forces. *Syracuse.*

David M. Thorpe. Program Development and Coordination of Agricultural Agencies. *Harvard.*

James D. Tschirgi, Administration of the Federal Mining Laws. *Chicago.*

Simon Tucker, The Development of the Employment Activities of the United States Civil Service Commission. *American.*

A. Donald Urquhart, The Conduct of Administrative Hearings in Metropolitan Los Angeles. *California* (Los Angeles).

Troy Westmeyer, Administration of Municipal Income and Payroll Taxes. *New York University.*

J. Lee Westrate, The Administrative Theories and Practices of Herbert Hoover. *Chicago.*

Russell W. Willey, The Spendings Tax—A Fiscal Aid in Controlling Inflation. *Pennsylvania.*

Walter Wilmot, Administration of Air Pollution Control. *Harvard.*

Jesse D. Winzenreid, The State of Wyoming: A History and Evaluation of Financial Administration. *New York University.*

John L. Withers, The Administrative Theory and Practice of William Howard Taft. *Chicago.*

Arthur Wolfe, American Civil Service Examinations. *Chicago.*

James R. Woodworth, Administration of the Pure Food, Drugs and Cosmetics Act since 1938. *Harvard.*

Laurence N. Woodworth, United States Taxation of Income Earned Abroad. *New York University.*

FOREIGN AND COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Bruce Adkinson, British Commonwealth in Southeast Asia. *Princeton.*

Bilquis Ali, The Pakistan Reform Movement, *New York University.*

Basher A. Aridi, Parties and Politics in Lebanon. *American.*

Eduardo D. C. Austin, The First Democratic Revolution in the Far East: Philippine 1895–1905. *Georgetown.*

Kemdi Azoma, Development of Federalism in Nigeria. *New York University.*

Hans H. Baerwald, Problems of Developing Democratic Leadership in Japan. *California* (Berkeley).

Samuel Barnes, The Political Role and Theory of Organized Labor in Canada. *Duke.*

Robert W. Barrie, The Council of Europe. *Minnesota.*

Paul Barringer, Soviet Policy Toward Scientific Research: A Case Study. *Harvard.*

Richard Barron, The Political Parties and the Fourth French Republic. *Viriginia.*

Richard Bender, Structure and Organization of the Associated States of Vietnam. *Cornell.*

William Berry, Problems in the Economic Development of British African Territories. *Harvard.*

Brij Bhushan, The Fundamental Rights in India: Indian Philosophic and Anglo-American Legal Concepts. *American.*

Byron E. Blankinship, Spain and World War I: A Study of Foreign Policy, 1910–1920. *Columbia.*

Robert C. Bone, Jr., West Irian, New Guinea, Microcosm of Conflict, 1949–1955. *Cornell.*

Louis C. Boochever, Jr., The Development of the Soviet Coal Industry. *Harvard.*

Conrad Brant, The Chinese Communist Party and the Comintern, 1924–1930. *Harvard.*

Cecil C. Brett, Local Autonomy in Okayama Prefecture, Japan: A Study of National-Local Relations. *Michigan.*

Lyle C. Brown, The Cardenas Administration in Mexico, 1934–40. *Texas.*

Ronald F. Bunn, The Organization and Political Theory of the Postwar German Employers' Federation. *Duke.*

Leo D. Cagan, Civil Service Unions: A Comparative Study of American and British Commonwealth Experience. *Chicago.*

Charles Carroll, Australia and Argentina: A Study of the Bases of Federal Government. *Harvard.*

Jay H. Cerf, A Study of Attitude Controls in the Membership State: The Sanction-Applying Process of the Freie Deutsche Jugend in the School and University System of the German Democratic Republic. *Yale.*

Sudershan Chawla, India and Communism. *Ohio State.*

Romeo A. Cherot, Kazakh Customary Law under the Russian Empire, 1824–1917. *Columbia.*

James B. Christoph, The Political Rights of State Workers in Great Britain. *Minnesota.*

Cathie L. Clark, The Development of Government and Administration in Brazil since 1889. *American.*

John M. Clarke, The Budget in the Central Government of the Commonwealth of Australia. *American.*

Onofre D. Corpuz, The Philippine Civil Service: Bureaucracy in Evolution. *Harvard.*

George R. Crossman, The Program of "Economic Democracy" in West Germany from 1945 through 1954. *Columbia.*

Chauncey R. Crutcher, The Federal District of the United Mexican States. *North Carolina.*

Jose M. de Gamboa, Philippine Political Parties as Instrument of Reform. *Cornell.*

Kurt DeWitt, The Relation between Civil and Military Power in a Totalitarian Dictatorship: The Wehrmacht and the Nazi Party 1933–1945. *George Washington.*

Alfred Diamant, The Course of Political Catholicism in Austria. *Yale.*

Roger Di-Gioja, The Problem of the Executive in France, and the Fear of Bonapartism. *Notre Dame.*

P. Allan Dionisopoulos, The Conduct of Foreign Policy Under Shigeru Yoshida. *California* (Los Angeles).

Jack D. Dowell, The Parliament of West Germany. *Stanford.*

Eugene Dvorin, The Political Development of the Central African Federation (No. Rhodesia, So. Rhodesia and Nyasaland). *California* (Los Angeles).

Marie A. Edwards, Labor Legislation in Occupied Japan, 1945–1950. *Northwestern.*

Rudolph Eilers, Foreign Policy Problems of the West German Government, 1942–1952. *American.*

Harold T. Ellis, The Development of the Constitution of Ireland, 1911–1923. *Stanford.*

John G. Eriksen, Church and State Relations In Germany, 1930–1945. *Minnesota.*

Augusto Espiritu, Communism and Civil Liberties in the Philippines. *Harvard.*

Phoebe Everett, Land Tenure in Burma. *Syracuse.*

Francesco G. Ferraroti, The Italian Managerial Elite. *Chicago.*

Josephine Fishel, The Fabian Society and the British Labour Party. *Duke.*

Cary O. Fisher, Revolution by Coup d'Etat: A Study of Modern Revolutionary Strategy and Tactics. *Stanford.*

William Fleming, Judicial Review of Chancellor von Papen's Coup d'Etat in 1932. *Columbia.*

Harold A. Fletcher, Jr., The Nationalization of Industry in France: A study of the Political and Administrative Aspects of the Problem. *Harvard.*

Vernon L. Fluharty, The Latin American Military Caesar and the Social Revolution: A Case Study of Colombia, 1946–1955. *Pittsburgh.*

Edwin Fogelman, British Constitutionalism and the Welfare State. *Princeton.*

Charles R. Foster, Postwar Changes in Structure and Ideology of the German Social Democratic Party. *Ohio State.*

Evan Fotos, Land Tenure and Rural Organizaation in Turkey Since 1923. *American.*

Lloyd Freese, The United States and the Birth of the States, *Chicago.*

Julian R. Friedman, The Impact of Democracy on Imperialism: A study of the British Colonial Administrative Service, *California* (Berkeley).

J. Richard Gaechter, Government Liability in Tort: A comparative Study of the French and Anglo-American Systems. *Cornell.*

Jesus de Galindez, Trujillo's Dominican Republic—A Case Study of a Latin American Dictatorship. *Columbia.*

Khalil A. Ghalayini, Organization and Administration of the Arab States: Selected Problems and the Problem of Arab Unity. *American.*

I. Paul Giardina, The Economic Effects of the Disposition of the Italian Colonies upon the Economy of Italy. *New York University.*

Walter I. Giles, British Colonial Policy and the Political Development of Jamaica, 1944–1954. *Georgetown.*

Jack Gourman, Germany: The Hitler State, 1933–1945. *California* (Los Angeles).

Norman D. Greenwald, The Soviet Union in British Labour Party Politics, 1933–1941. *Columbia.*

Gene Gregory, Local Administration and Organization in Vietnam. *Cornell.*

Werner Grunbaum, Civil Liberties and the Cold War in Great Britain. *Chicago.*

William B. Gwyn, Democracy and Political Expenses in Nineteenth Century England. *Virginia.*

John Robert Habicht, Executive Legislation and Its Control in Switzerland. *Ohio State.*

Norman B. Hannah, The Government of Thailand. *Minnesota.*

Louis K. Harris, Political Organization and Problems of Mexico City. *California* (Los Angeles).

Tetsuichi Hashimoto, The Developments in Japanese Bureaucracy Since World War II. *Duke.*

John Haupert, The Swedish Foreign Policy During the Second World War. *Syracuse.*

Dan F. Henderson, The Pattern and Persistence of Traditional Procedures in Japanese Law. *California* (Berkeley).

Laurin L. Henry, International Technical Assistance in Public Administration. *Chicago.*

Paul H. Heppe, The Ideology of the Canadian Liberal Party, 1921–1951. *Wisconsin.*

Alfred Hero, Individualism and the French Political Elite: A Study of National Character. *George Washington.*

James K. Herold, The Role of the Trade Unions in Nationalized Industries—A Case Study: The National Union of Mineworkers. *Harvard.*

H. Grant Hicks, Chinese Nationalist Administration and Reform in Formosa. *Columbia.*

Karl A. Hochschwender, The Politics of Civil Service Reform in Western Germany. *Yale.*

H. M. Holland, Japanese Political Parties in the 1920's and 1930's. *George Washington.*

Ernest V. Hollis, Jr., Police Systems of Imperial and Soviet Russia, 1700–1938. *Columbia.*

Leonard J. Horwitz, United States-Argentine Relations, 1943–1947, with Special Reference to the Braden-Peron Affair. *Pennsylvania.*

George Howatt, An Evaluation of Australian Experience with Preferential Voting and Proportional Representation. *Pennsylvania.*

Kyaw Htun, Problems of Industrial Development in Post-War Burma. *Chicago.*

Earl Huyck, Population Growth in South Asia: A Study in Differential Fertility in India and Ceylon. *American.*

W. Carter Ide, The Politics of French Labor. *Harvard.*

Ifekwunigwe Aroh, Problems of Federal Regionalism in Nigeria. *New School.*

Eric G. James, Administrative Planning in the British Caribbean, with Special Reference to Jamaica. *New York University.*

T. M. Joshi, Economics of Public Finance in Bombay. *Pennsylvania.*

Wadie Jwaideh, The Contemporary Kurdish Problem. *Syracuse.*

Misha N. Kadick, Soviet Use of Manpower. *Princeton.*

Eli Kaminsky, The French Government and the Communists Since 1947. *Harvard.*

Mehdi Kianfar, Greater Syria. *American.*

Jerome B. King, Agencies for the Coordination of the Ministries of the Fourth Republic. *Stanford.*

Stephen P. Koff, Pacifism and the British Labour Party. *Columbia.*

Roy D. Laird, The Amalgamation of Collective Farms in the USSR. *Washington* (Seattle).

Jean A. Laponce, The Protection of Civil Liberties: A Comparative Study. *California* (Los Angeles).

Harry Lazer, Balfourian Conservatism: A Study in Political Ideas and Political Leadership. *Columbia.*

Daniel C. Lazorchick, The Issue of Nationalization within the British Labour Party. *Stanford.*

Frank M. Lewis, The Multi-Party System in the Presidential Form of Government in Chile. *Texas.*

J. Gus Liebenow, Jr., Comparative Studies of Indirect Rule in British East Africa. *Northwestern.*

Oscar M. Lopez, The Philippine Revolution. *Harvard.*

Jerry K. Loveland, Cohesive Elements in the Commonwealth. *California* (Los Angeles).

Ruth H. Lutz, The Political Parties in Mexico. *Pittsburgh.*

Charlie Lyons, Jr., The Effect of the Point Four Program on Indian Public Opinion. *Ohio State.*

Thomas H. McLeod, Dominion-Provincial Conferences as a Technique in Intergovernment Coordination. *Harvard.*

Sidney Mailick, The Emergence of a System of Administration in Israel. *Chicago.*

Ram C. Malhotra, Administrative Reorganization of the Government of Nepal. *American.*

Joseph F. Marsh, British Departmental Decentalization: A Study of National Departmental Organization in the Southern (#6) Standard Region for the Administration of Public Health and Welfare Services. *Harvard.*

David K. Marvin, Development of Conceptual Analysis for Study of African Political Systems in Transition. *Northwestern.*

Gordon P. Means, The Evolution of Self-Government in Malaya. *Washington* (Seattle).

Frank A. Mesplé, The Native Political Parties of French North Africa. *Stanford.*

Edmund C. Mester, The Road to Political Democracy in Turkey. *Maryland.*

Frank O. Miller, Minobe Tatsukichi—Exponent of Liberal Constitutionalism under the Meiji Constitution. *California* (Berkeley).

George R. Monsen, De Gaulle and the R.P.F.: Man, Movement, and Mystique. *Stanford.*

Henry W. Morton, The Political Character of Soviet Sports. *Columbia.*

Steven Muller, The Prime Ministership in Canada. *Cornell.*

Mirza Shikoh Muzaffar, The Constitutional Development in Pakistan: Its Problems and its Prospects. *New York University.*

P. N. Narayanan Nair, The Office of the District Collector in the Government of India. *Cornell.*

Robert Nave, Local Government in the United Provinces: India. *Minnesota.*

Fred W. Neal, The Reforms in Yugoslavia: Titoism in Action. *Michigan.*

Joe W. Neal, The State Governments of Northeastern Mexico: Coahuila, Nuevo Leon and Tamaulipas. *Texas.*

Mark Neuweld, The Central Organization of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union: the Structure, Leadership and Dynamics of Development. *Harvard.*

Eze A. Ogueri, The Indirect Rule System;

Its Theory and Practice, and the Idea of Self-Government (Independence) in the British Colonial and Protectorate Policy in Nigeria, 1890–1950. *Harvard.*

Stelios Papadakis, An Introduction to the Constitutional History of Modern Greece. *Pennsylvania.*

H. Carroll Parish, Jr., The Development of Democratic Institutions in Thailand. *California* (Los Angeles).

Don Peretz, Israel and the Arab Refugees. *Columbia.*

Lawrence L. Petersen, The Swedish Cooperatives and Politics. *Notre Dame.*

Hyrum Plaas, A Comparative Study of the Governments of the Benelux Countries. *Utah.*

Arieh L. Plotkin, An Analytical Study of Israel's Role in the United Nations. *Princeton.*

Ivan M. Ponedel, The Development of English Labor Law: The Legal Position of the Laborer from 1349 to the Present. *California* (Berkeley).

Robert W. Quick, French Political Attitudes toward European Integration, 1950–1954. *California* (Los Angeles).

Herbert F. Quinn, The Nationalist Movement in Quebec since 1930: The Impact of Industrialization on Party Politics. *Columbia.*

Gabriel Racz, Changes in the Economic Structure of Hungary under Communist Rule (1948–53) and their Sociological Implications. *New York University.*

G. V. Sudhaker Rao, Public Personnel Management in Hyderabad State. *Columbia.*

Dillwyn F. Ratcliff, Spain 1923–30: Experiment in a Political Improvisation. *New School.*

Alfred Rath, A Study of the Trust Territories in Africa Administered by the United Kingdom. *Southern California.*

Enuga S. Reddy, Village Government in South India. *Columbia.*

Ralph Retzlaff, The Praja Socialist Party. *Cornell.*

Linford D. Riley, Jr., The Associated State Concept in Vietnam. *California* (Los Angeles).

Leslie G. Rofe, The French Economic Council. *Columbia.*

William L. Rofes, A Study of the Prime Minister in Great Britain. *Columbia.*

Leo E. Rose, The Effect of Occupation Policy upon the Labor Movement in Japan. *California* (Berkeley).

Thomas A. Rusch, The Role of Socialist Ideology in the Congress Party of India, 1931–1951. *Chicago.*

I. Milton Sacks, Communism and Nationalism in Vietnam. *Yale.*

Salim Salim, Labor Problems in Four Arab Countries (Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan). *Southern California.*

Will J. Selzer, The Trusteeship Council of the United Nations and Self-Government, with Particular Reference to British Administration in Africa. *Pennsylvania.*

George A. Shanker, Constitutional Techniques to Avoid Undemocratic Majorities in Democratic Legislatures. *New School.*

F. Burke Sheeran, Federalism in the United States, Canada, and Australia, with Particular Reference to Selected Institutional and Functional Aspects. *Southern California.*

Koji Shimatzu, Methods of Communist Penetration in Japanese Labor Unions. *Notre Dame.*

Charles E. Shumaker, The Malayan Chinese Association. *Ohio State.*

Josef Silverstein, Asian Socialism. *Cornell.*

Seymour Slessinger, Nationality Doctrine as an Instrument of Soviety Foreign Policy. *Boston University.*

Brenton H. Smith, The Fall of France and the Armistice Agreements with Germany and Italy, June 22–25, 1940. *Michigan.*

Elmer W. Smith, British Political Parties: The Role of the Annual Party Conference. *Harvard.*

Olga C. Sonder, Political Processes and Electoral Procedures under the Indian Republican Constitution Put into Effect on January 26, 1950. *Stanford.*

Herbert G. Sonthoff, Robert von Mohl and the Problem of German Federalism. *Harvard.*

James R. Soukup, A Study of the Political Activities of Selected Japanese Labor Unions. *Michigan.*

Frances L. Starner, The Philippine Agrarian Problem and Its Political Implications. *California* (Berkeley).

Charles I. Stastny, The Hungarian Communist Party: A Study of Ideology and Operational Development. *Harvard.*

Hans Steinitz, Native Participation in Colonial Government in the French Territories in Africa. *New School.*

Eleonore Sterling, Anti-Semitism in Germany (1800–1848). *New School.*

Herbert Storing, Consultation of Interests in the Formulation of Administrative Rules in the United Kingdom. *Chicago.*

Melvin P. Straus, The Control of Subversive Activities in Canada. *Illinois.*

Ulrich A. Straus, The Japanese House of Councillors: An Analytical Study. *Michigan.*

Robert S. Sullivan, The Ukraine and the Union of Soviety Socialist Republics: A Study in Soviet Policy and Ukrainian Nationalism. *Chicago.*

Zoltan M. Szaz, The Principal Foreign Policy Problems of the Federal Republic of Germany, 1949–53. *Catholic University.*

Harold M. Thewlis, Authoritarian Tendencies in the French Right, 1924–1940. *Columbia.*

Jack E. Thomas, The Organizational Structure and Administration of SHAPE. *California* (Berkeley).

Robert F. Thompson, The Retention and Rejection of Occupation Reforms in Japan after the Signing of the Peace Treaty. *Minnesota.*

Hugh G. Thorburn, The Politics of New Brunswick: A Study of the Growing Importance of the Acadian Population in the Political Life of the Province. *Columbia.*

Thomas W. Thorsen, The Administration of Medical and Health Services in Scandinavia. *Utah.*

Roy Tollefson, Political Thought in the Norwegian Labor Party (1917–1928). *Chicago.*

Lois E. Torrence, The Canadian Party System. *American.*

Frank Untermyer, The Problem of Federation in the British Central African Colonies. *Chicago.*

Margaret D. Urist, Nationalism in Guatemala. *Southern California.*

Wilhelmus Van Eekeren, The Catholic People's Party in the Netherlands: A Study of its Origin, Theory, Policy, and Political Significance. *Georgetown.*

George Vlasak, The Czech Political Tradition, A Study in the Formative Period. *New York University.*

Melvin Wachs, Public Administration and Government in Thailand. *Cornell.*

Eric Waldman, The Spartacus Uprising in 1918: Study of the Relation between Theory and Practice in the German Social Democratic Party. *George Washington.*

Harold Webb, The Liberal Party in England: Theory and Practice. *Brown.*

David Wilson, Political Changes in Thailand. *Cornell.*

Ernst F. Winter, Austrian Agrarian Policy, 1945–1953. *Columbia.*

Ernest Wohlgemuth, The Politics of Labor in West Germany. *Chicago.*

George E. Wolff, Executive-Legislative Relations in the Third French Republic, 1920–1940. *North Carolina.*

John Wortman, The Socialist Unity Party in Soviet Germany: Problems of a Satellite Party. *Minnesota.*

Laurence Wyatt, Some Freedoms in England Today. *Minnesota.*

Willard R. Yates, An Examination of the Leading Constitutional and Social Ideas of the Mouvement Republicain Populaire, 1945–1947. *Yale.*

Manoog S. Young, Russia and the Armenian Question since 1917. *Clark.*

Phoebe Yu, A Comparison of the British and American Personnel Systems. *Chicago.*

Janusz Zawodny, Self-Assertion in the Soviet Factory: Study of Worker Grievances and Their Adjustment. *Stanford.*

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION, POLITICS AND LAW

Robert L. Abbey, The World Health Organization: A Study in the Functional Approach toward International Organization. *Harvard.*

Walter Adamson, Ecuador: A Study in Economic Development. *Fletcher School.*

Kenneth P. Adler, Can Adult Education Affect Foreign Policy? *Chicago.*

Charles E. Allen, The Development and Significance of International Health Collaboration, 1792–1950. *Stanford.*

Luther A. Allen, The French Left and Soviet Russia, 1933–1940. *Chicago.*

Brent Allison, A Projected Survey of the Historian's War against War. *Chicago.*

Clovis Altice, The State of Israel in International Law. *Catholic University.*

Eliece A. Altroggen, Power Politics in Sinkiang since 1860. *Chicago.*

Abdul-Malik S. Al-Zaibag, Iraq Oil Politics in the Inter-War Period. *Columbia.*

Charles D. Ameringer, Never Abandon Panama! The Story of Philippe Bunau-Varilla and the Panama Canal. *Fletcher School.*

Nan Louise G. Amstutz, The Establishment of an Indonesian Importing Class, 1950–53. *Fletcher School.*

John A. Anderegg, The Marshall Plan: A Historic Reversal of United States Foreign Policy. *Rutgers.*

Albert Androsky, Indian Policy in the United Nations. *Chicago.*

Tranquilino B. Aquino, Philippine-American

Trade Relations with Particular Reference to the Post War Period. *American.*

Arne Arnersen, The Scope and Practice of the Domestic Jurisdiction Clause in the United Nations Charter. *Minnesota.*

Henry Austin, India's Position in and Policies with Respect to Asia during the Period 1947–1954. *American.*

Fenton Babcock, Contradiction between Objective and Principle in United States Policy toward China, as Revealed in the Records of Congress for the Period 1941–1949. *Yale.*

Hager W. Bach, The Position of the United States in the United Nations in Regard to Political Developments in Non-Self-Governing Territories. *Chicago.*

William Baier, Concepts of National Interest in the 1840's. *Brown.*

Bettie J. Baker, Toward an Understanding of International Regionalism. *Michigan.*

Marjorie Murphy Baldwin, The Sterling Area and the European Payments Union, 1950–1953. *Fletcher School.*

Arthur C. Banks, Jr., International Law and the Second World War. *Johns Hopkins.*

Edward Barber, The Evaluation of National Power. *Georgetown.*

Irving Barnett, UNRRA's Experience in China. *Columbia.*

Sidney N. Barnett, Judicial Interpretations of the United Nations Charter in International and National Courts. *Columbia.*

George Basich, The Effect of Russian Expansion on British Political Opinion, 1763–1856. *Chicago.*

Liesel G. Baum, Preparation of the Agenda of the United Nations General Assembly. *Columbia.*

Frederick O. Beattie, III, The Utility of Theories of Aggression to the Understanding of International Relations. *Chicago.*

Anne B. Beeler, The International Labour Organization: Important Developments in Its Structure, Function and Constitution since 1953. *Cornell.*

Mirza Anwer Beg, United Nations Attitudes to the Use of Advisory Opinion Procedure of the International Court of Justice. *Columbia.*

John A. Bekker, The Soviet Union and World Organization. *Chicago.*

Aaron Bell, The United States' Doctrine of the Just War. *Chicago.*

Leonard Berkowe, The Fund and GATT as Instruments for the Prevention of Economic Conflict in the Postwar World. *Columbia.*

Sylvan Berman, Nazi-Soviet Relations, 1938–1941: A Study in Conflicts of Ideology and Expediency in International Relations. *American.*

Helen A. Blackway, Ideas and Opinion Determinants in Foreign Policy Issues. *Pennsylvania.*

John D. Blumgart, The Political Consequences of the American Aid in Greece. *Columbia.*

Helen Bonnell, The International Economic Position of Iran. *American.*

William G. Bowdler, The Quest for Collective Security in the Americas. *Fletcher School.*

Robert J. Bower, The Russians in North America up to 1824. *Chicago.*

James E. Boyce, The United States and the Integrity of China (1898–1908). *Fletcher School.*

Henderson B. Braddick, International Relations between the United States and Italy, 1937–1941. *Washington* (Seattle).

Jan J. Brazda, The Korean Armistice: A Study in American-Chinese Communist Negotiations. *Florida.*

J. Cudd Brown, The United Nations Trust Territory in Tanganyika. *American.*

Weldon J. Brown, The Political Aspects of Commercial Trade Controls in Central and South America. *American.*

Jean E. Buckens, Land Tenure and Labor Conditions among Indigenous Peoples. *Fletcher School.*

Edwin C. Buell, The Institute of Inter-American Affairs: A Study of Inter-Governmental Cooperation. *North Carolina.*

William S. Caldwell, The Organization and Operation of American Informational and Propaganda Activities in Postwar Italy. *Minnesota.*

Russell B. Capelle, The M.R.P. and French Foreign Policy. *Boston University.*

George A. Carroll, American Policy Concerning Control of Atomic Energy. *Fletcher School.*

Webster C. Cash, A Comparative Study of the Specialized Agencies in the United Nations: The Relation of Their Functions to Their Organizational Forms. *Chicago.*

Alphonso Castagno, Regional Influences in Italian Foreign Policy. *Columbia.*

Nancy G. Cattell, Soviet Policy and the German Revolution of 1918–19. *Columbia.*

Mangalam Chacko, Weighted Voting in International Organizations with Special Reference to the Voting Procedures in the United Nations. *New York University.*

Harry M. Chase, Anglo-American Relations, 1945–Present. *Syracuse.*

Chu Pei Chen, The Diplomatic Services of Major Powers. *New York University.*

Kwen Chen, Legal Status, Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, Its Related Organizations and Their Personnel. *Michigan.*

Shin-Chai Chen, Study of the Agenda of the Security Council. *New York University.*

Yu-Ching Chen, American Policy and the Collapse of Nationalist China. *New York University.*

Tao Cheng, The Protection of Persons and Property: Evolution of Clauses in Bilateral Treaties. *Columbia.*

H. Dicken Cherry, Mainsprings of Nationalism in Southeast Asia. *Chicago.*

Chieh Yue Chiang, The Concept and Development of International Responsibility for Colonial Administration. *Washington* (Seattle).

Charles K. Chu, Philander Knox's Far Eastern Policy. *Chicago.*

Isaac Ciechanowicz, Soviet Views on International Law as Reflected in the United Nations. *New York University.*

George C. Constantinides, The United States and Greece, 1940–47: A Study in Foreign Policy. *Harvard.*

Ralph E. Cook, The United States and the Armenian Question, 1895–1925. *Fletcher School.*

William G. Cornelius, The Latin American Bloc in the United Nations. *Columbia.*

Brownlee S. Corrin, The United Nations, the United States and the U.S.S.R. from Dumbarton Oaks to Korea: A Study in Controversy and Cooperation. *Stanford.*

Morton H. Cowden, Soviet and Comintern Policy toward the British Labor Movement, 1917–26. *Columbia.*

Richard F. Crabbs, Administrative Aspects of Technical Assistance. *Stanford.*

Martin G. Cramer, T.C.A. Program in India. *Fletcher School.*

Jackson H. Crowell, Central American Relations of the United States, 1869–1877. *Fletcher School.*

Dorothy Culbertson, A Supra-National Authority to Deal with Aggression: Critical Analysis of Private Proposals Since 1945. *Columbia.*

Frank J. Curtis, Jr., The Role of Argentina in the United Nations. *Pennsylvania.*

Zein Dabbagh, Method and Procedure of Concluding Treaties in Saudi Arabia in the Light of the Rules of International Law. *Cornell.*

William B. Dale, Full Employment and American Foreign Policy. *Fletcher School.*

William M. David, Jr. U.S. Policy toward the Baltic States, 1917–1922. *Columbia.*

Margaret M. Davies, The Role of the American Trade Union Representatives in the Aid-to-Greece Program. *Washington* (Seattle).

Grant R. Davy, Canadian Policies in the United Nations. *Fletcher School.*

Anton DePorte, The European Policy of France, 1944–1947. *Chicago.*

Francois M. Dickman, The Economic Foreign Policy of the United States in Western Europe from 1945 to 1948. *Fletcher School.*

Winston Dindial, India's Role in World Affairs. *New York University.*

Joseph John Richard Dobrich, The European Political Community: A Political-Legal Study. *New School.*

Dorothy Dodge, The Recognition of Communist China: Legal and Political Aspects. *Minnesota.*

Joseph F. Dolecki, Polish Foreign Policy, 1932–1945. *New York University.*

Marion E. Doro, The Problem of Statelessness before the UN. *Cornell.*

Arthur E. Dowell, Appeasement and Conciliation in Global Crises, 1938–1948. *Chicago.*

Margaret W. Dower, The International Thinking of George Bernard Shaw. *Boston University.*

Edward Drake, The Soviet Alliance System. *New York University.*

Martin D. Dubin, The Concept of Collective Security in the Pre-World War I Peace Movement. *Indiana.*

William B. Dunn, Franco-British Relations in Southeast Asia, 1863–1904. *Chicago.*

Marvin Lyle Durham, The American Expansionist Movement in Mexico, 1848–1862. *Fletcher School.*

Maria Perry Eaves, Prelude to War in Eastern Europe: Romania and the Powers, 1931–1941. *Columbia.*

Harold E. Engle, The Place of International Administration in the Structure of International Politics: A Critical Study of "Functionalism." *Columbia.*

Eliezer Ereli, Truce Supervision by the United Nations. *Fletcher School.*

Mohsen S. Esfandiary, The Role of the General Assembly in Dealing with Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace and Acts of Aggression. *Columbia.*

Phoebe Everett, International Administration: A Comparative Study of the Caribbean and South Pacific Commissions. *Syracuse.*

Bernard Fall, The Post-War Problem of Indo-China. *Syracuse.*

Edwin H. Fedder, The Privileges and Immunities in the United States of the Property and

Personnel of the U.N. and Specialized Agencies. *American.*

Milton Feder, Great Power Relations in the Origin and Development of the Kingdom of Libya. *Michigan.*

Edmund S. Finegold, The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. *Harvard.*

Lawrence S. Finkelstein, Indonesia and the United States. *Columbia.*

Marina Salvin Finkelstein, The Soviet Challenge in the Balkans. *Columbia.*

Arthur Frank, The Wool-Growers and Their Struggle for Political and Economic Security. *Utah.*

Robert W. Frase, Proposals for the International Control of AtomicEnergy. *Harvard.*

Harry J. Friedman, Consolidation of India since Independence: A Comparison and Analysis of Four Indian Territorial Problems—Kashmir, Hyderabad, Portuguese Possessions and French Possessions. *Pittsburgh.*

C. Dale Fuller, The Soviet Union's Concept of the League of Nations as an Instrumentality for the Maintenance of Peace, 1934–1939. *Columbia.*

Richard F. Gardner, The Relations of the United States and Spain from 1898 to 1948. *Fletcher School.*

Frederick Gareau, American Policy Toward German Industrial Disarmament, 1943–1950. *American.*

Geraldine S. Garlick, Communist Interpretations of the Causes of War. *Iowa.*

Richard A. Geisler, Military Collaboration in the Western Hemisphere. *New York University.*

Charles Gendreau, Agricultural Settlement and Colonization in Latin American National Development Program. *Minnesota.*

John S. Gibson, The Impact of Regional and Limited Security Arrangements upon the United Nations as an International Peace and Security Organization. *Columbia.*

Eggert W. Giere, The Peace Treaty with Germany: A Study in American Foreign Policy, 1942–1952. *Washington* (Seattle).

Bryant Giles, Anti-Colonialism in the Western Hemisphere. *Yale.*

John S. Gillespie, The Role of the Director-General in the Development of the International Labor Office. *Columbia.*

Meredith Gilpatrick, Strategy of the Western Front, 1871–1914. *Chicago.*

Alvin B. Glaser, The Development of Regionalism within the United Nations. *New York University.*

Mehmet Gonlubol, Turkish Participation in the United Nations. *New York University.*

Elliott R. Goodman, The Soviet Design for a World State. *Columbia.*

Marjorie H. Gordon, The New Japanese Constitution. *Indiana.*

Robert C. Gordon, The North Atlantic Treaty Organization: A Study in Comparative International Organization. *California* (Berkeley).

Budda V. Govindaraj, The Role of India in the Settlement of Disputes within the United Nations. *Michigan.*

Angelina Grammatico, The United Nations and the Development of Human Rights. *New York University.*

Morris A. Greene, The Transfer of a Functioning International Organization from One Site to Another. *American.*

Robert W. Gregg, International Narcotics Control under the Aegis of the United Nations. *Cornell.*

Frances A. Gulick, Agrarian Problems in Indonesia. *Fletcher School.*

Eric J. Haas, The Modern Problem of Intervention. *New York University.*

Jamal Haddad, The Soviet-Iranian Treaty of 1921. *New York University.*

Ahmad Haffar, The Middle East as an Area of International Conflict. *Utah.*

Lorna H. Hahn, India in the American Press, 1949–1953: A Quantitative and Qualitative Study. *Pennsylvania.*

Sania Hamady, Exploration in the Arab National Character: Salient-Common Traits among the Arabs. *Chicago.*

Pyo-Wook Han, Post-War Developments in Korean Government. *Michigan.*

Thomas H. Handy, Russia and Postwar Anglo-American Relations. *Texas.*

John Hanessian, Jr., The Question of Western European Integration. *Syracuse.*

Milan E. Hapala, The Russian Question and the Evolution of the Czechoslovak Political Parties. *Duke.*

Maurice Harari, Boundaries in the Near and Middle East: A Political Analysis. *Columbia.*

Bruce B. Harlow, Determinants in International Relations: An Inquiry into Fundamentals. *Columbia.*

Takeshi Haruki, Japanese Foreign Policy at the Time of the Tripartite Pact, 1940. *Southern California.*

Bartlett Harvey, Foreign Policy and Public Opinion: The Shift in Policy toward the German Economy, 1945–48. *Harvard.*

Malcolm Hay, Jr., British Opinion of Nazi Germany, 1933–1939. *American.*

Joseph A. Hearst, American Policy in Occupied Italy. *Columbia.*

Charles Heimsath, The Participation of India in the Korean War and its Settlement. *Yale.*

William A. Helseth, The Turkish Aid Program, 1947: A Study in United States Foreign Policy. *Fletcher School.*

Maurice Héroux, Canadian Outlooks on Foreign Policy Matters, 1914–1923. *Georgetown.*

Wilhelm G. Hertz, The Swiss Conception of International Law. *Columbia.*

Wilbur W. Hitchcock, Defense of National Honor as Justification for Military Measures. *Pennsylvania.*

Conrad P. Homberger, A Theory of International Relations. *Columbia.*

Robert D. Hopkirk, Toward More Effective Co-ordination of United Nations Economic and Social Activity. *New York University.*

Robert J. Horgan, American Thought on the Soviet Union, 1933–1939. *Notre Dame.*

Joseph E. Hoskins, The United Nations and World Disarmament. *Pennsylvania State.*

Charles W. Hostler, The Turks of the Soviet and Western Orbits and their Unifying Ideals. *Georgetown.*

Thomas Hovet, Jr., The General Assembly of the United Nations: An Analysis of the Establishment and Development of Its Organization and Procedures. *New York University.*

Allen Hovey, Jr., Politics of Unity: The European Movement and the Council of Europe. *Columbia.*

Albert J. Hoyt, The Role of Regionalism in Contemporary World Politics. *Southern California.*

Robert P. Huff, Diplomatic Relations between Spain and the United States, 1945–1953. *Stanford.*

Dunning Idle, IV, Indonesian Neutralism and the Cold War. *Yale.*

Thomas A. Israel, The Implications of the Social Contract Theory for International Organization and International Law. *Illinois.*

Hoyt Milton Jackson, Aggression as Defined by the United Nations. *Nebraska.*

Richard Jaffe, Japanese Aggression in Southeast Asia, 1938–1941. *Chicago.*

Louis C. James, Relations of the North American Railroads: A Study in International Cooperation of the Railroads of Canada, Mexico and the United States. *Columbia.*

Raymond Van Kirk Johnson, Development and Administration of the International Broadcasting Program of the United States. *Stanford.*

Doris W. Jones, The First Moroccan Crisis and the Foreign Policy of Theodore Roosevelt. *Fletcher School.*

Howard W. Johnston, The Minds of Free Men: A Study of the United States Public Affairs Program in Germany. *Columbia.*

Catherine S. Kadragic, Role of the League of Nations in the Pacific Settlement of Political Disputes in the Balkans. *Columbia.*

Subbiah Kannappan, The Indian Trade Union Movement: An Account and An Analysis. *Fletcher School.*

Pierre Keller, National Attitudes toward Western European Integration. *Yale.*

George H. Kelly, The Union Francaise and French Colonial Policy. *Stanford.*

William B. Kelly, Jr., The 1927 Convention on the Abolition of Import and Export Prohibitions and Restrictions: Its Significance in United States Commercial Policy. *Fletcher School.*

Jesse C. Kennedy, American Foreign Policy in China, 1937–1950: An Analysis of Why It failed. *Chicago.*

Nancy Jane Kenney, The Economic Ideas of Gandhi and Indian Economic Planning. *Fletcher School.*

Cyrus H. Khabiri, Position of Iran in Contemporary World Affairs. *American.*

Chonghan Kim, Konoye Fumimaro and Japanese Foreign Policy: 1937–1941. *Indiana.*

Chase Kimball, A Commentary on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. *Fletcher School.*

Gottfried-Karl Kindermann, Chiang Kai-Shek and the Causes for the Disintegration of the First Sino-Soviet Entente. *Chicago.*

Robert F. Kobee, The Personnel Problem of the United Nations Secretariat: The Study of a Career Service. *Fletcher School.*

Ross Y. Koen, The China Lobby and the Formulation of American Foreign Policy, 1945–1951. *Florida.*

Maximilian Koessler, The Dachau Trials: A Study of the War Crime Trials. *Columbia.*

Leon Koruciewicz, Polish-German Diplomatic Relations, 1934–1939. *California* (Berkeley)

Seldon M. Kruger, Major British Foreign Policies in the United Nations, 1945–1955. *Rutgers.*

Shiwaram K. Kshirsagar, Development of Relations between India and the United States Since 1947: a Study in Political, Economic and Cultural Problems. *American.*

Max Landau, Political and Legal Aspects of Discrimination with Special Reference to North American Investments in some Latin American Countries. *New York University.*

Lawrence Lazar, International Law and Diplomatic Asylum. *Fletcher School.*

Brue LeMessurier, The United States Senate and America's Latin American Policy, 1938–50. *Chicago.*

Sigrid Leube, The Position of Non-Member States with Regard to International Organizations: The League of Nations and the United Nations. *New York University.*

Janathan Levin, Systems of Export Taxation in Export Economics. *Fletcher School.*

Hua-Wei Li, The Development of Economic and Social Rights by the United Nations. *New York University.*

Paul Ta-Kuang Lin, Problems in the Policy of the British Commonwealth toward the Japanese Empire, 1921–1941. *Harvard.*

Arthur W. Lindsley, The Problem of Control over Current Methods at Conflict between Nations. *New York University.*

Eugene E. Lindstrom, The Nordic Council. *Stanford.*

Seward Ling, The Administrative Tribunal at the United Nations. *New York University.*

Pichon Pei-Yung Loh, China: Its Westernization and Nationalism, 1919–1926. *Chicago.*

Stephen Low, Colonial Policy and Population Growth in the Philippines. *Fletcher School.*

Stuart H. McIntyre, Legal Effect of War on Treaties. *Columbia.*

Joseph C. McKenna,S.J., Diplomatic Protest as an Instrument of United States Foreign Policy. *Yale.*

Charles B. McLane, Soviet Policy towards the Chinese Communists, 1935–1949. *Columbia.*

Charles H. McLaughlin, Principles of Treaty Interpretation. *Columbia.*

Robert L. McNeill, United States Policy Toward Self-Government for Puerto Rico, 1898–1952. *Fletcher School.*

John MacDonald, Reservations to Multilateral Treaties. *Cornell.*

Virginia H. MacLean, Foundations of Egyptian Foreign Policy. *Fletcher School.*

Raymond D. Mack, The Development of the Inter-American Regional System: The Contribution of the Jurists. *Indiana.*

Norman Mackie, Jr., France's Security Policy toward Germany, 1944–1947. *Columbia.*

James W. Mahoney, India in the Commonwealth. *Fletcher School.*

Alfredo Manat, The Relations of the United States and the Philippines Since the Coming into Effect of the Commonwealth Act, 1935–1950. *Chicago.*

Yunan Mao, The Principle of Sovereign Equality in the United Nations. *Chicago.*

Melvin M. Marcus, Voting Procedure in the Practice of the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations. *Michigan.*

Bruce Marshall, The Evolution of French Colonial Policy in the Area of French West Africa during the Period Following the Second World War. *Yale.*

Gerald Maryanov, Domestic Jurisdiction in the United Nations. *Indiana.*

Everett K. Melby, The Refugees in Western Germany. *Chicago.*

Stanley Millet, The Principles of Majority Rule and International Organization. *New School.*

Frances Mond, The United Nations Commission on Human Rights. *Columbia.*

Carol C. Moor, New Guinea: A Study of International Colonialism. *New York University.*

Glenn Guy Morgan, An Evaluation of the Role of the Specialized Organizations of the Organization of American States. *Virginia.*

Andrew J. Morse, An Analysis of British Opinion in Reaction to the American Initiative During the Postwar Years. *Chicago.*

Leo John Moser, The Human Rights Program of the United Nations, 1945–1955. *Southern California.*

Norman W. Mosher, State Trading and Great Britain: A Case Study of State Trading, Methods of Its Implementation, the Effects on the National Economy and Its Relation to Multilateral Trade. *Fletcher School.*

Daniel P. Moynihan, United States and the International Labor Organization. *Fletcher School.*

Robert J. Myers, The Political Philosophy of Japan's Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere. *Chicago.*

Charles W. Naas, The Development of a Constitution for Pakistan. *Fletcher School.*

Harold I. Nelson, The Making of the German Territorial Settlement, 1919. *Columbia.*

Inez Nelson, The Security of Small States. *Chicago.*

Norman W. Nelson, Subsidies to Producers as A Substitute for Tariffs. *Fletcher School.*

Randall H. Nelson, United States Practice in the Negotiation and Conclusion of International Agreements Since 1940. *Michigan.*

Bernard Norwood, United States Government Procurement Abroad. *Fletcher School.*

Leon Novar, Great Power Conflicts in Iran; 1920–21 and 1943–47: A Comparison. *Chicago.*

Grady Nunn, Coordination of U.N. and other American Agencies. *New York University.*

Irwin Oder, The United States and the Palestine Mandate, 1920–1948. *Columbia.*

Eiichi Okajima, The Japanese Peace Treaty and its Implications on Japan's Post-War Foreign Policy. *New York University.*

Eric H. Olson, The New Colonial Administration of West Africa. *Syracuse.*

Gene D. Overstreet, The Soviet View of India and Communist Policy in India: A Study of Strategy and Tactics. *Columbia.*

Robert von Pagenhardt, The Executive Office and Powers of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. *Stanford.*

Alexander A. Palamiotis, The Legal Status of Greece in Post-War International Relations. *Utah.*

Frank Parrella, European Recovery Program vs. Communism in Italy, 1948–1950. *Georgetown.*

R. V. Patwardhan, Possible Development of a Regional System in South East Asia. *New York University.*

Devere E. Pentony, The Marshall Plan: Declared Objectives, Apparent Effects. *Iowa.*

Oscar Perlmutter, The Foreign Policy of Dean Acheson: A Case Study in the Conduct of Foreign Relations in a Democracy. *Chicago.*

Robert J. Peterson, The Status of Manchuria since 1931. *Chicago.*

Harry E. Pierson, The Significance of Sea Power in the Politico-Economic Affairs of the Countries of the Western Pacific Areas. *American.*

Emil R. Platig, The Philosophy of International Relations of John Foster Dulles. *Chicago.*

Adamantia Pollis, The Effects of Great Power Policy on Greek Nationalism. *Johns Hopkins.*

John A. Power, Financing of the United Nations and Its Specialized Agencies. *Catholic University.*

John W. Price, The Council of Europe: An Experiment in European Integration. *Michigan.*

Ross J. Pritchard, Will Clayton, A Study of Business-Statesmanship in the Formulation of United States Economic Foreign Policy. *Fletcher School.*

Fahim I. Qubain, The Impact of the Petroleum Industry in Iraq, Bahrain, and Kuwait: A Case Study. *Wisconsin.*

Charles A. Raith, The United Nations as Viewed by American Isolationists and Internationalists. *Pennsylvania.*

Milton Rakove, American Attitudes Toward Negotiations with the Soviet Union. *Chicago.*

Abdul J. Rawi, The Termination of the Lebanese Mandate and its Aftermath. *American.*

Beulah B. Reifel, Recent Developments in International Law Regarding Territorial Waters. *American.*

Vladimir Reisky-Dubnic, A Study of Propaganda Methods in Czechoslovakia Aiming for Closer Integration with the Soviet Union. *Chicago.*

Peter Remec, The Position of the Individual in International Law According to Grotius, Vattel, Oppenheim. *Chicago.*

Elizabeth H. Reynolds, An Examination of Collective Security with Special Reference to the Korean Conflict. *Southern California.*

George H. Ried, Administration of an International Police Force. *Syracuse.*

Najmuddin Rifai, Lybia—Road to Independence. *Columbia.*

Robert E. Riggs, The Policy of the United States with Respect to Political Questions in the General Assembly of the United Nations. *Illinois.*

Alfred S. Rigsbee, A Study of Functional International Organization in Its Administrative Aspect. *Indiana.*

Walter L. Riley, An Analysis of the Law of the International Military Tribunal of the Far East. *Washington* (Seattle).

Dorothy Roberts, The Role of Partisanship in the Conduct of the Foreign Relations of the United States. *Chicago.*

Berta Rodriguez, International Criminal Jurisdiction and Genocide. *Cornell.*

John M. Rogers, The International Authority for the Ruhr, 1948–1952. *American.*

George K. Romoser, The Theory of Resistance to Tyrants: A Study of the Motives and Purposes of the German Resistance. *Chicago.*

Neale Ronning, Contribution of the Organization of American States to Peaceful Settlement of Disputes in the Western Hemisphere. *Minnesota.*

H. S. Royce, Jr., Political Action and a Future Malaya: A Study of Malaya's Chinese Political Action Groups. *Columbia.*

Paul Rupprecht, The International Position of Hungary in the U.S. Foreign Policy, 1933–47. *Minnesota.*

Donald E. Russell, Revolution in China: A Study in American Reactions. *Chicago.*

Hassan H. Saab, The Arab Approach to Federalism. *Georgetown.*

Wallace Safford, Psychological Operations in International Relations. *American.*

Isamu Sato, The Impact of International Relations upon the Government and Politics of Japan. *Chicago.*

Charles E. Savige, A Study into the Obligatory

Character of Resolutions Passed by the Principal Organs of the League of Nations and the United Nations. *Florida.*

Bert P. Schloss, The American Occupation of Germany: An Appraisal. *Chicago.*

Theresa Schmatz, The Status of Dependent Areas in International Organizations in the Field of Communications. *Columbia.*

Donald H. Scott, The Cultural Relations Program of the United States in Mexico. *Southern California.*

Esther Seeman, The Administration of the Minorities Treaties by the League of Nations and Its Implications for the United Nations. *Minnesota.*

Charles B. Selak, Jr., Reservations to Multilateral Treaties. *Columbia.*

Otis Shao, American China Policy in 1937. *Brown.*

Valentine Sherring, A Critical Study of India'. Participation in the U.N. Operationss *American.*

Barbara J. Shockley, The Creation of a European Nationality. *Pennsylvania.*

William Simonson, Nazi Infiltration in South America, 1933–1945. *Fletcher School.*

Joel D. Singer, The Fiscal Process in the United Nations. *New York University.*

Herman T. Skofield, Private Foreign Investment. *Fletcher School.*

Robert F. Smith, The Policy of the United States toward Political Unity in Germany, 1945–1953. *Chicago.*

Glenn Snyder, Civil-Military Perspectives on Raw Materials Security Policy. *Columbia.*

James W. Spain, The North-West Frontier: Political Problems of a Borderland. *Columbia.*

Gordon L. Spangler, Conflicts in United States Agricultural and Trade Policies, 1933–1955. *Fletcher School.*

George S. Springsteen, The British Navigation Law: The Influence of Foreign Nations Upon Their Modification and Repeal, 1783–1849: A Study in Commercial Policy. *Fletcher School.*

Emil Starr, The British Labour Party and the Soviet Union. *Chicago.*

George W. Steckel, The U.N. General Assembly: Its Powers and Functions. *Johns Hopkins.*

David J. Steinberg, British Policies and Administration Relating to the Economic Development of the Sterling Area 1945 to 1955. *Harvard.*

David B. Stenzel, The End of Appeasement: Anglo-German Relations from Munich to the Outbreak of the War (30 Sept., 1938–3 Sept., 1939). *California* (Berkeley)

Peter Stercho, The Carpatho-Ukraine in World Affairs, 1938–1940. *Notre Dame.*

Elizabeth I. Sterenberg, The Role of Forced Labor in Economic Development. *Chicago.*

Charles Stermer, Early Relations Between the Spanish Philippines and China. *Chicago.*

Herman A. Stern, The Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization. *New York University.*

Virgil H. Stevens, Personnel Problems Peculiar to International Agencies: A Study in International Administration. *Southern California.*

Albert C. Stillson, The Use of Military Force in Peace by the United States Government: Civilian and Military Attitudes toward the Use of Military Force in Peace and Their Application. *Columbia.*

Jonathan D. Stoddart, The Influence of Immigrant Groups on United States Foreign Policy. *Fletcher School.*

Lois J. Stone, Anglo-Russian Relations in Central Asia, 1885–1892. *Columbia.*

George S. Sugden, Influence of the Submarine on United States Foreign Policy. *Fletcher School.*

Owart Suthiwart-Naruepут, The Evolution of Thailand's Foreign Relations Since 1855; From Extraterritoriality to Equality. *Fletcher School.*

Howard J. Taubenfeld, International Legal Problems of Collective Action by International Organizations. *Columbia.*

Loren E. Tesdell, The Middle East And Technical Cooperation. *Stanford.*

Barbara J. Teters, The Conservative Opposition in Japanese Politics from 1878–1894. *Washington* (Seattle).

Joseph M. Thom, The International Legal Status of the Refugee. *Washington* (St. Louis).

William W. Thomas, Francis Lieber and the International Law of Land Warfare. *North Carolina.*

Donald Thomson, The Geneva Convention of 1949 Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. *American.*

Clarence E. Thurber, Contributions of the State of California to the Point Four Program. *Stanford.*

Leif Tobiasson, Access to United Nations. *New York University.*

Peter A. Toma, Soviet Participation in the Danube Commission. *California* (Los Angeles).

Donald R. Toussaint, The French Contribution to the Political Unification of Europe, 1944–1953. *Stanford.*

Erwin W. Umbach, A Study of the Foreign Relations of the United States with Austria. *Fletcher School.*

Margaret D. Urist, An Analysis of the Participation of Guatemala in the Pan American Conferences: 1883–1933. *Southern California.*

Carlos A. Urrutia, The Right of Diplomatic Asylum. *American.*

Juliane von K. Valentin, German-Japanese Relations in the Period between the Two World Wars. *Pennsylvania.*

Teimoor Vaziri, The Economic Relations of Iran and America since World War II. *New York University.*

Charles W. Vear, Organized Labor and the Tariff. *Fletcher School.*

G. Hans Voelkel, Discrimination Against Aliens in International Law. *Columbia.*

Kalman von Voros, The Origins of the Munich Pact of 1938. *Georgetown.*

Lawrence Wadsworth, The International Military Tribunal for the Far East: Trial of Major Japanese War Criminals. *American.*

David Warren, Munitions, Production and Export in Relation to American Foreign Policy, 1914–1936. *Fletcher School.*

Paul Weaver, Soviet Interference in the Government of Iran, 1941–1951. *American.*

James L. Weber, The Development of the Foreign Policy Objectives of the British Labor Party, 1919–1939. *Fletcher School.*

Melvin A. Weightman, The Present Status of the Concept of Self-Defense in International Law. *Pennsylvania.*

Guenter Weissberg, The International Personality of Entities other than Independent States. *Columbia.*

John E. Westburg, General Theory and Practice of Modern Federalism. *Southern California.*

Alan Furman Westin, American Diplomatic Relations with the Vatican. *Harvard.*

Harold B. Whiteman, Norman H. Davis and the Functional Approach to Collective Security. *Yale.*

Donald J. Whitney, Developments in the Field of International Law in the U.N. *American.*

Ponnambalam Wignaraja, The Conflict between Economic Rationality and Cultural Values: An Analysis of Four Policies for Increasing the Availability of Domestic Savings for Developmental Needs. *Yale.*

Robert Wilfong, UNRRA and Displaced Persons. *Harvard.*

Haydn Williams, Air Power and American Foreign Policy: The Berlin Air Lift. *Fletcher School.*

Maurice J. Williams, The Problem of Economic Integration in Western Europe. *Chicago.*

Ann R. Willner, Problems in Agricultural Production for the Domestic Market in Venezuela. *Chicago.*

Martin W. Wilmington, Regional Cooperation for Supply and Development in the Middle East During World War II (The Middle East Supply Center). *New York University.*

Kurt Wimer, United States Executive-Legislative Tensions in Relation to the League of Nations Covenant and the United Nations Charter. *New York University.*

Harry Winkler, The Political Orientation of Israel in the Struggle between East and West. *Chicago.*

Gregory B. Wolfe, The Montevideo Conference, 1933: Reactions of the North and South American Press to Foreign Policy of the United States. *Fletcher School.*

Thomas W. Wolfe, Soviet Leadership. *Georgetown.*

Klaus Wolff, Pioneer Entrepreneurs in Industry: A Study in the Sociology of Industrialization. *Chicago.*

Claude Woltz, Bloc Action in the United Nations. *New York University.*

Wah Wong, The Problem of 'Self-Determination' in the United Nations. *New York University.*

Herbert H. Wood, Jr., International Supervision of Colonial Administrative Unions. *Columbia.*

Theodore P. Wright, Jr., American Support of Free Elections Abroad. *Yale.*

David Wurfel, The Bell Report and After: A Study in the Political Problems of Social Reform through Foreign Aid. *Cornell.*

Stephen G. Xydis, The Armed Forces and the Psychological Strategy of the Great Powers in Greece, 1944–1947. *Columbia.*

Agnes Hwun-giat Yao, Comparison of Mandates and Trusteeship. *Chicago.*

Abraham Yeselson, American-Persian Relations, 1883–1918. *Brown.*

Tien-Cheng Young, The Use of Scientific Management Concepts in International Administration. *New York University.*

William I. Zartman, A Study of Neutralism in France since World War II. *Yale.*

Rev. Erwin W. Zinger, Korea As a Test of the Effectiveness and Validity of the Concept of Collective Security. *Pennsylvania.*

II: DISSERTATIONS COMPLETED SINCE THE LAST LISTING

POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY AND PSYCHOLOGY

Robert P. Boynton; B.A., Calvin, 1949; M.A., Michigan, 1951; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. The Political Philosophy of George Santayana. *Michigan.*

Donald W. Brandon; A.B., California (Berkeley), 1949; M.A., *ibid.*, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. A Thomistic Conception of the Welfare State. *California* (Berkeley).

Karl H. Cerny; B.A., Princeton, 1945; M.A., Yale, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Catholic Social Thought in the United States. *Yale.*

Samuel Cook; A.B., Morehouse College, 1948; M.A., Ohio State, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. Ethical Foundations of Democracy. *Ohio State.*

David Cooperman; B.A., Minnesota, 1947; M.A., *ibid.*, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. Power, Force, and Violence: An Examination of Traditional and Revolutionary Aspects of Political Theory in the Light of a Hypothesis of Limits to Action. *Minnesota.*

James Eayrs; A.B., Toronto, 1948; A.M., Columbia, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. The Political Ideas of Thomas Spence. *Columbia.*

Murray B. Levin; A.B., Harvard, 1947; A.M., Columbia, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Thomas Hodgskin, A Study in the Development of Ricardian Socialism. *Columbia.*

Donald K. McKee; A.B., North Carolina, 1937; M.S.S., New School for Social Research, 1939; Ph.D., Columbia, 1955. The Intellectual and Historical Influences Shaping the Political Theory of Daniel de Leon. *Columbia.*

Edward N. Megay; Law Degree, Academy of Law, Kecskemét, 1943; Ph.D., Georgetown, 1955. The Political Philosophy of Henrich von Treitschke. *Georgetown.*

Abelardo Patino; B.S., Northwest Missouri State Teachers College, 1949; Ph.D., American, 1955. The Political Ideas of the Liberal and Conservative Parties in Colombia during the 1946–1952 Crisis. *American.*

Truman A. Potter; B.A., Minnesota, 1939; M.A., *ibid.*, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. Some Recent American Criticisms of Liberalism. *Minnesota.*

John H. Schaar; A.B., *California* (Los Angeles), 1950; M.A., *ibid.*, 1952; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. An Inquiry Into the Principles of Political Loyalty in America. *California* (Los Angeles).

Judith Nisse Shklar; B.A., McGill University, 1949; M.A., *ibid.*, 1950; Ph.D., Harvard, 1955. Fate and Futility: Two Themes in Contemporary Political Theory. *Harvard.*

Stanley Thames; A.B., Mississippi, 1949; A.M., *ibid.*, 1950; Ph.D., Duke, 1955. An Analysis of Representative Ideological Criticism of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization in the United States, 1946–1954. *Duke.*

John F. Wallerstedt; B.A., Rockhurst College, 1942; M.A., Georgetown, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. The Political Thought of Henry Jones Ford. *Georgetown.*

GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS OF THE UNITED STATES AND ITS DEPENDENCIES

Edward M. Bernshtein; B.A., Chicago, 1941; J.D., *ibid.*, 1949; M.A., *ibid.*, 1953; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. The Bricker Movement to Amend the Constitution. *Chicago.*

William Buchanan; A.B., Washington & Lee, 1941; M.A., Princeton, 1951; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Partisanship and Presidential Voting in 1952. *Princeton.*

Harold W. Chase; A.B., Princeton, 1943; M.A., *ibid.*, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. Controlling Subversive Activities. *Princeton.*

Joseph E. Dougherty, Jr.; B.A., St. Charles Seminary, 1944; M.A., Georgetown, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. The Genesis of the Social Security Act of 1935. *Georgetown.*

Thomas P. Emerich; B.A., Kansas, 1929; M.B.A., Pennsylvania, 1940; Ph.D., Georgetown, 1955. The United States' Shipbuilding Industry and National Policy. *Georgetown.*

Lawrence Howard Fuchs; B.A., New York University, 1950; Ph.D., Harvard, 1955. The Political Behavior of American Jews. *Harvard.*

Irving Howards; B.A., Wisconsin, 1949; M.A., *ibid.*, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. The Influence of Southern Senators on American Foreign Policy from 1939 to 1950. *Wisconsin.*

Clifford Ketzel; A.B., California (Los Angeles), 1942; M.A., California (Berkeley), 1947; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Exchange of Persons and Foreign Policy: The Foreign Leader Program of the Department of State. *California* (Berkeley).

David D. Levine; A.B., Wisconsin, 1938; M.A., *ibid.*, 1940; Ph.D., American, 1955. The Executive Order: A Form of Presidential Participation in the Legislative Process. *American.*

S. D. Lovell; B. S., Tennessee, 1939; M.A., Georgia, 1947; Ph.D., Ohio State, 1954. The Presidential Campaign of 1916. *Ohio State.*

John C. Lowe; B.A., State University of Iowa, 1951; M.A., *ibid.*, 1953; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. New Deal Democracy: Its Impact on American Democratic Processes. *Iowa.*

Ira C. Polley; B.A., Indiana, 1938; Ph.D., Minnesota, 1954. Wage Stablization Program in Region Eight: A Case Study. *Minnesota.*

George Robinson; A.B., New York University, 1948; A.M., *ibid.*, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. The Development of the Senate Committee System. *New York University.*

Robert A. Shanley; B.A., Columbia, 1946; M.A., *ibid.*, 1948; Ph.D., Georgetown, 1955. The League of Women Voters—A Study of Pressure Politics in the Public Interest. *Georgetown.*

Edgar L. Shor; B.A., Pittsburgh, 1938; M.A., Chicago, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Political Role of the Secretary of Labor. *Chicago.*

Rhoten A. Smith, Jr.; A.B., Kansas, 1946; M.A., *ibid.*, 1948; Ph.D., California (Berkeley), 1955. Majority Rule in American Theory and Practice. *California* (Berkeley).

Robert C. Spencer; B.A., Chicago, 1943; M.A., *ibid.*, 1952; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. The Steel Dispute of 1952: A Case Study in the Politics of Collective Bargaining. *Chicago.*

Virgil Stroud; B.S., A & T College of North Carolina, 1937; A.M., New York University, 1952; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. Congressional Investigations of the Conduct of War. *New York University.*

Robert W. Van de Velde; B.S., Princeton, 1933; M.P.A., *ibid.*, 1952; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. The Role of U.S. Propaganda in Italy's Return to Political Democracy, 1943–1948. *Princeton.*

John P. Vloyantes; B.S., Western State College, 1943; M.S., Utah, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., As Secretary of State. *Utah.*

CONSTITUTIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE LAW IN THE UNITED STATES

Barton Bean; B. A., Buffalo, 1942; Ph.D., Cornell, 1955. The American Civil Liberties Union: History and Analysis. *Cornell.*

Alfons J. Beitzinger; Ph.B., Marquette, 1940; M.A., Chicago, 1947; Ph.D., Wisconsin, 1954. Chief Justice Ryan of Wisconsin Supreme Court. *Wisconsin.*

Moshe Eliash; B.A., Oxford University, 1951; Ph.D., Cornell, 1955. A Government of Men: An Analysis of the Discretionary Powers Delegated to the Executive. *Cornell.*

Charles W. Engelland; B.A., Kansas State College, 1948; M.A., State University of Iowa, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. The Bricker Amendment. *Iowa.*

Howard I. Forman; B.S., St. Joseph's, 1937; LL.B., Temple, 1944; A.M., Pennsylvania, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. United States Patent Ownership Policy and Some of its Administrative Implications. *Pennsylvania.*

Milton Greenberg; B.A., Brooklyn, 1949; M.A., Wisconsin, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. The Loyalty Oath in the American Experience. *Wisconsin.*

Martin B. Hickman; B.S., Utah, 1951; M.A., *ibid.*, 1952; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. Utah Constitutional Law. *Utah.*

Harry S. Manley; A.B., Westminster College, 1942; LL.B., Pittsburgh, 1945; Ph.D., Duke, 1955. The Extension of Federal Criminal Jurisdiction in the United States, 1910–1954: A Study in Federalism. *Duke.*

Lawrence Noble; A.B., Mississippi, 1950; M.A., Duke, 1953; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. The Registration of Subversives in the United States. *Duke.*

Gilbert L. Oddo; B.A., Union College, 1948; M.A., Georgetown, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. Justice Douglas and the Roosevelt Court. *Georgetown.*

Robert H. Salisbury, Jr.; A.B., Washington & Lee, 1951; A.M., Illinois, 1952; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. The United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit: A Study in Policy Formation. *Illinois.*

AMERICAN STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Twiley W. Barker; A.B., Southern University, 1948; A.M., Illinois, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. State Liquor Monopolies in the United States. *Illinois.*

George Bell; B.A., University of Newark, 1936; M.A., New Jersey State Teachers College, 1940; Ph.D., Michigan, 1955. The Michigan Municipal League: An Analysis of Policies and Services. *Michigan.*

Wen-Pin Chen; A.B., Wu-han University, China, 1941; A.M., Illinois, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. State Supervision and Control over Local Law Enforcement in the United States. *Illinois.*

Fenton Asher Gage; A.B., Union College, 1937; A.M., Syracuse, 1939; Ph.D., Harvard, 1955. Municipal Housing Authorities of "Up-State" New York. *Harvard.*

Delphis Clark Goldberg; A.B., Union College, 1942; A.M., Harvard, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Public Assistance Standards in New York State: A Study of Intergovernmental Relations in the Administration of a Grants-in-Aid Program. *Harvard.*

Stewart L. Grow; B.S., Brigham Young University, 1935; M.S., *ibid.*, 1948; Ph.D., Utah, 1954. A Study of the Utah Commission, 1882–1896. *Utah.*

Donald J. Kreitzer; B.A., University of Dayton, 1946; M.A., University of Cincinnati, 1948; Ph.D., Ohio State, 1955. Urban Redevelopment in Columbus, Ohio. *Ohio State.*

Virginia E. Lewis; A.M., Washington University, 1935; Ph.D., New York University, 1955. Fifty Years of Politics in Memphis. *New York University.*

Lee Moore; B.A., Franklin and Marshall, 1941; Ph.D., Pennsylvania State, 1954. Annexation and the Administration of Metropolitan Areas in Pennsylvania. *Pennsylvania State.*

Harold L. Rakov; B.S., Syracuse, 1946; PhD., *ibid.*, 1955. The Political Orientation of the Public School as Reflected in the Evolution and Present Structure of the New York State Public School System. *Syracuse.*

Martin R. Ream; B.S., Franklin and Marshall, 1929; A.M., Pennsylvania, 1951; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Financial Aspects of State Monopoly and State Licensing of Alcoholic Beverages, With Special Reference to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New York. *Pennsylvania.*

Walter F. Scheffer; B.S., Eau Claire State Teachers College, 1943; M.S., Wisconsin, 1947; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Some Inter-Governmental Problems in Post-War Highway Financing and Administration in Wisconsin—With Special Reference to the Truck. *Wisconsin.*

David W. Smith; B.S., Utah, 1947; M.A., *ibid.*, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. The Legislative Council Movement in the United States. *Utah.*

John Vanderzell; A.B., Miami University (Ohio), 1949; Ph.D., Syracuse, 1955. State Legislation Relating to Standards Development in Building Regulation. *Syracuse.*

Anson E. Van Eaton; B.S., State Teachers College, Kirksville, Missouri, 1925; M.A., Missouri, 1930; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. The Initiative and Referendum in Missouri (1908–1953). *Missouri.*

J. Roffe Wike, II; A.B., Princeton, 1948; A.M., Pennsylvania, 1951; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. The Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association: A Study of a Political Interest Group in the Governmental Process. *Pennsylvania.*

Arthur B. Winter; A.B., Emory University, 1947; M.S., University of Denver, 1948; Ph.D., Duke, 1955. Special Governmental Districts in Tennessee. *Duke.*

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN THE UNITED STATES

George Bennett Alcorn; S.B., California (Berkeley), 1936; S.M., *ibid.*, 1937; Dr. P.A., Harvard, 1955. Walnut Markets: Chaos, Control, and Countervaillance. *Harvard.*

Richard Ball; A.B., Notre Dame, 1941; M.A., Indiana, 1942; Ph.D., Notre Dame, 1955. The Significance of the Autonomous Governmental Corporation for Public Administration Theory. *Notre Dame.*

Clifford Leonard Berg; A.B., Minnesota, 1942; M.P.A., Harvard, 1951; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Career Development in a Federal Scientific Agency. *Harvard.*

David S. Brown; A.B., Maine, 1936; Ph.D., Syracuse, 1955. The Public Advisory Board in the Federal Government: An Administrative Analysis of Several Boards With Particular Attention to the Public Advisory Board of the Economic Cooperation Administration and the Mutual Security Program. *Syracuse.*

Vernon Webster Darter; A.B., King College, 1926; S.B., Tennessee, 1930; M.P.A., Harvard, 1952; Dr. P.A., *ibid.*, 1955. County Extension Program: Case Histories of Twelve Counties. *Harvard.*

John T. Dorsey, Jr.; B.A., Alabama, 1949; M.A., *ibid.*, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Administration and the Process of Communication: A Case Study of the Tennessee Valley Authority. *Alabama.*

George Goodwin, Jr.; A.B., Williams College, 1943; A.M., Harvard, 1947; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. The Railroad Industry. *Harvard.*

Paul S. Greenlaw; A.B., Syracuse, 1952; M.A., Clark, 1953; Ph.D., Syracuse, 1955. Legislative Riders and Federal Personnel Administration: A Case Study of the Jensen, Thomas, and Whitten Amendments. *Syracuse.*

Lawrence J. Herson; B.A., Northwestern, 1948; M.A., *ibid.*, 1949; M.A., Yale, 1951;

Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. State Administrative Organization: The Precedent of Illinois. *Yale.*

Milton Goren Johnson; A.B., Drury College, 1936; A.M., Chicago, 1937; M.P.A., Harvard, 1952; Dr. P.A., *ibid.*, 1955. Foundations for Program Administration in a Federal System: Development of Public Medical Care for Children in Oklahoma. *Harvard.*

Garth N. Jones; B.S., Utah Agricultural College, 1947; M.S., Certificate in Public Administration, Utah, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. Administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. *Utah.*

Alan Keith-Lucas; A.B., Cambridge University, 1931; A.M., *ibid.*, 1935; Ph.D., Duke, 1955. Decisions About People in Need: A Study of Administrative Responsiveness in Public Assistance. *Duke.*

Donald W. Krimel; B.Ed., Northern Illinois State Teachers College, 1941; M.Ph., Wisconsin, 1946; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. The Public Communications Functions of the Federal Government: An Examination Primarily Directed Toward Development of a More Precise Definition of the Study Area. *Wisconsin.*

Maurice Joseph Mountain; A.B., Brown, 1948; A.M., Harvard, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Domestic Operations of the Office of War Information: A Case Study in Wartime Government Publicity. *Harvard.*

Maurice E. O'Donnell; B.S., Eastern Illinois State College, 1948; M.S., Wisconsin, 1951; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. The Growth of Independent Agencies in Foreign Economic Affairs. *Wisconsin.*

W. Scott Payne; A.B., University of Colorado, 1939; A.M., *ibid.*, 1941; M.P.A., Harvard, 1947; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. The Certification of United States Carriers for Foreign Air Transportation: A Case Analysis in Public Policy. *Harvard.*

Palmer C. Pilcher; A.B., Syracuse, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Liability of Hospitals and Hospital Administrators. *Syracuse.*

Jewel Limar Prestage; B.A., Southern University, 1951; M.A., State University of Iowa, 1952; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. The Status of the First Hoover Commission Report: An Analysis of the Roles of the President and Congress. *Iowa.*

Alan Rankin; A.B., Fort Hays Kansas State College, 1937; M.A., Syracuse, 1939; D.S.S., *ibid.*, 1955. The Administration of Federal Contract and Grant Research. *Syracuse.*

Mary Ruth Rapp; S.B., Indiana, 1934; A.M. George Washington, 1950; M.P.A., Harvard, 1951; Dr. P.A., *ibid.*, 1955. 4-H Awards Study. *Harvard.*

Lloyd William Schram; B.A., Washington (Seattle), 1934; LL.B., *ibid.*, 1937; LL.M., Harvard, 1938; Ph.D., Washington (Seattle), 1955. The Columbia River Basin and the Columbia Basin Joint Investigations with Special Reference to Problem 12. *Washington* (Seattle).

William D. Spear; B.A., State University of Iowa, 1950; M.A., *ibid.*, 1953; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. A Plan of Integration of Labor Functions within a State Department of Labor in Iowa. *Iowa.*

Thomas Hugh Strong; S.B., Queensland University, Australia, 1935; S.M., *ibid.*, 1937; M.P.A., Harvard, 1949; Dr. P.A., *ibid.*, 1955. Agriculture in Relation to Balanced Economic Development in Australia. *Harvard.*

Maurice K. Townsend; B.A., Boston University, 1949; M.A., Chicago, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. A Study of Attitudes Toward the Division of Duties in Personnel Administration. *Chicago.*

Marshall Owen Watkins; S.B., Florida, 1935; S.B., *ibid.*, 1948; Dr. P.A., Harvard, 1955. The Role of the Agricultural Extension Specialist in the Land-Grant College. *Harvard.*

George William Westcott; S.B., Iowa State College, 1926; S.M., *ibid.*, 1932; M.P.A., Harvard, 1946; Dr. P.A., *ibid.*, 1955. The Evolution of Rural Planning: An Important Area for Strengthening the Democratic Processes and Optimizing the General Welfare. *Harvard.*

Donald Wilhelm, Jr.; A.B., Yale, 1938; Ph.D., Harvard, 1955. Some Aspects of the Administration of Industrial Development in Burma, 1952–1953. *Harvard.*

FOREIGN AND COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Harry J. Benda; B.A., University of New Zealand, 1950; M.A., *ibid.*, 1952; Ph.D., Cornell, 1955. The Crescent and the Rising Sun; Indonesian Islam under the Japanese Occupation of Java, 1942–1945. *Cornell.*

Frank R. Brandenberg; A.B., Southern California, 1950; A.M., Pennsylvania, 1951; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Mexico—An Experiment in One-Party Democracy. *Pennsylvania.*

Ben G. Burnett; A.B., California (Los Angeles), 1948; M.A., *ibid.*, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955.

The Colombian Party System: A Contemporary Analysis. *California* (Los Angeles).

Tse-Tsung Chow; B.A., Central Institute for Political Science, Chungking, China, 1942; M.A., Michigan, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. The May Fourth Movement and Its Influence upon China's Socio-Political Development. *Michigan.*

Alessandro L. Corradini; Doctor of Economics, University of Florence, Italy, 1939; M.A., Wisconsin, 1941; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. The Conduct of Foreign Affairs in Great Britain. *Wisconsin.*

George Demetriou; B.A., Hobart College, 1941; Ph.D., *Minnesota,* 1954. A Consideration of Some Aspects of the Problem of Illegitimacy in Venezuelan Politics, 1830–1953. *Minnesota.*

Khaled I. El-Saghieh; Licentiate in Law, Syrian University, 1949; Ph.D., American, 1955. Nationalism in Morocco: A Study of Recent Developments with Special Reference to the Moroccan Question in the United Nations. *American.*

Bernard B. Fall; M.A., Syracuse, 1952; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Political Development in Viet-Nam; VJ-Day to the Geneva Cease-Fire. *Syracuse.*

John L. Groom; B.A., Wheaton College, 1942; B.D., Northern Baptist Seminary, 1945; Ph.D., Southern California, 1955. The Function of Soviet Power: A Critique of a Modern Despotism. *Southern California.*

Susan Han; B.A., St. John's University, China, 1948; M.Ed., Mercer University, 1949; Ph.D., Chicago, 1955. The Concept of the Proletariat in Chinese Communism. *Chicago.*

William S. Hardenbergh; A.B., Illinois, 1950; A.M., *ibid.*, 1951; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. British Government in British Columbia. *Illinois.*

Bernard C. Hennessy; B.A., Syracuse, 1948; M.A., *ibid.*, 1949; Ph.D., Wisconsin, 1955. British Trade Unions and International Affairs, 1945–1953. *Wisconsin.*

Ursula Holtermann; B.S., London School of Economics, 1948; M.A., Chicago, 1951; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Political Parties in Western Germany. *Chicago.*

Roy E. Jumper; A.B., South Carolina, 1948; M.A., *ibid.*, 1949; Ph.D., Duke, 1955. The Recruitment and Training of Overseas Administrators: A Case Study in French Bureacracy. *Duke.*

Hossein Kazemzadeh; Licence, Law School Teheran University, 1947; Ph.D., Princeton, 1954. Iran and the United Nations: A Study in the Political Behavior of a Small Power. *Princeton.*

John J. Kennedy; A.B., New Mexico, 1936; A.M., Columbia, 1938; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. Donoso Cortes as Servant of the State. *Columbia.*

James D. Kitchen; A.B., California (Los Angeles), 1947; M.A., *ibid.*, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Local Government in Guatemala. *California* (Los Angeles).

Samuel Kucherov; A.M., Columbia, 1947; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Courts, Lawyers and Trials Under the Last Three Tsars. *Columbia.*

Jerzy J. Lerski; M. Jur., Oxford University, 1946; Ph.D., Georgetown, 1953. The United States and the Polish Exiles of 1831. *Georgetown.*

Gerhard Loewenberg; B.A., Cornell, 1949; M.A., *ibid.*, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. The Effects of Governing on the British Labour Party, 1945–1951. *Cornell.*

Albert Anthony Mavrinac; A.B., Pittsburgh, 1943; A.M., *ibid.*, 1950; Ph.D., Harvard, 1955. The French Popular Democratic Party, 1924–40: A Study in Social Catholic-Christian Democratic Political Action. *Harvard.*

Douglas H. Mendel, Jr.; B.A., Middlebury, 1942; M.A., Michigan, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Political Behavior in Post-Treaty Japan: A Study of Leadership and Constituents' Attitudes in Two Selected Areas. *Michigan.*

Edward W. Mill; A.B., Wisconsin, 1940; M.A., Michigan, 1941; Ph.D., Princeton, 1954. The Conduct of Philippine Foreign Relations. *Princeton.*

Kenneth E. Miller; A.B., Kansas, 1949; M.A., *ibid.*, 1951; Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 1955. The British Labour Party and Theories of Socialist Foreign Policy, 1900–1931. *Johns Hopkins.*

Hazem Zaki Nuseibeh; A.B., American University Beirut, 1943; Law Degree, Jerusalem Law School, 1949; M.P.A., Princeton, 1952; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. The Ideas of Abrab Nationalism. *Princeton.*

Gabriel U. Onukaogu; A.B., Friends, 1950; Ph.D., Indiana, 1955. Conditions Affecting the Administration of Technical Assistance Programs in Nigeria. *Indiana.*

Leon Vincent Padgett; A.B., Northwestern, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Popular Participation in the Mexican One-Party System. *Northwestern.*

Roland I. Perusse; A.B., Wisconsin, 1946;

M.A., Notre Dame, 1951; Ph.D., American, 1955. The Study of the Problems of Contemporary Germany, with Particular Emphasis on the Question of German Reunification and Germany Integration into the Western Community of Nations. *American.*

Jesse Harris Proctor; A. B., Duke, 1948; M.A., Fletcher School, 1949; Ph.D., Harvard, 1955. The Effort to Federate the British Caribbean Territories–1945 to 1953. *Harvard.*

James Riedel; B.S., University of Denver, 1942; M.A., *ibid.*, 1943; Ph.D., Chicago, 1954. The British Debate on Foreign Policy, 1945–1950. *Chicago.*

Owen W. Roberts; A.B., Princeton, 1948; M.I.A., Columbia, 1951; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. The French Socialist Party and its Indo-China Policy. *Columbia.*

John H. Romani; B.A., New Hampshire, 1948; M.A., *ibid.*, 1949; Ph.D., Michigan, 1955. The Philippine Presidency: An Evaluation in Terms of American Practice and Procedure. *Michigan.*

Susanne Hoeber Rudolph; B.A., Sarah Lawrence College, 1951; Ph.D., Harvard, 1955. Congress in Power: A Study of Party in the Context of Asian Democracy. *Harvard.*

Theodore L. Shay; A.B., Northwestern, 1949; M.A., *ibid.*, 1951; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Tilak, Gandhi, and Arthasastra. *Northwestern.*

Kurt L. Shell; B.Sc., Columbia, 1948; A.M., *ibid.*, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. The Austrian Socialist Party Since 1945—Socialism in the "Age of Fulfillment." *Columbia.*

Donald Victor Smiley; B.Ed., University of Alberta, 1947; M.A., *ibid.*, 1951; Ph.D., Northwestern, 1954. A Comparative Study of Party Discipline in the Houses of Commons of the United Kingdom and Canada and in the Congress of the United States. *Northwestern.*

Kurt Steiner; J.D., Vienna, 1935; Ph.D., Stanford, 1955. Local Government in Japan. *Stanford.*

Abdul H. Tabibi; M.A., George Washington, 1949; Ph.D., American, 1955. Aftermath Created by British Policy in Respect to Afghanistan-Pakistan Relations. *American.*

Paul Van der Veur; B.A., Swarthmore, 1949; M.A., Minnesota, 1950; Ph.D., Cornell, 1955. Introduction to a Socio-Political Study of the Eurasians in Indonesia. *Cornell.*

Carlo F. Weiss; B.A., Columbia, 1946; Licence es Sciences, Geneva, 1947; M.A., Yale, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Catholic Corporatism in Italy. *Yale.*

Paul Ernest Zinner; S.B., Tufts College, 1943; A.M., Harvard, 1951; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Strategy and Tactics of the Czechoslovak Communist Party. *Harvard.*

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION, POLITICS AND LAW

Samuel Abrahamsen; B.A., College of Trondheim, Norway, 1937; M.A., Univ. of Oslo, 1938; Ph.D. *New School,* 1955. Sweden's Foreign Policy Since World War I. *New School.*

Latheef N. Ahmed; A.B., University of Mysore, India, 1942; M.A., Kansas, 1951; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. The Administrative Committee on Coordination: An Inter-Secretariat Coordinating Machinery of the United Nations Family of Agencies. *Kansas.*

Stewart Cole Blasier; A.B., Illinois, 1947; A.B., Columbia, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. The Cuban and Chilean Communist Parties—Instruments of Soviet Policy (1935–1948). *Columbia.*

C. Paul Bradley; A.B., Yale, 1947; A.M., Columbia, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. New Trends in British Colonial Policy. *Columbia.*

Barbara Brady Burn; A.B., Michigan, 1947; A.M., Fletcher School, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. International Law for the Administration of Non-Self-Governing Territories. *Fletcher School.*

Robert O. Byrd; A.B., College of Puget Sound, 1938; M.A., American, 1939 (Public Administration); M.A., Columbia, 1945 (International Administration); Ph.D., Chicago, 1955. Quaker Alternatives to Official Policy in the Field of International Relations. *Chicago.*

George Carnett; B.A., Akron, 1950; M.A., Syracuse, 1951; Ph.D., Yale, 1955. Communist Exploitation of the Yugoslav Nationality Question with Specific Reference to the Serbo-Croat Antagonism. *Yale.*

J. Leo Cefkin; A.B., Southern California, 1948; A.M., Columbia, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. United States National Commission of UNESCO. *Columbia.*

Yu Nan Chang; B.A., Washington (Seattle), 1951; M.A., *ibid.*, 1952; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. American Security Problems in the Far East, 1950–1952. *Washington* (Seattle).

Ping-Lang Chao; Cert., Central Institute of Political Science, China, 1937; A.M., New York University, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Finality of International Arbitral Awards. *New York University.*

Martin J. Clancy; Ph.B., Marquette University, 1941; LL.B., *ibid.*, 1943; Ph.D., Georgetown, 1952. Rules of Land Warfare Observed by the American Army During the American Revolution. *Georgetown.*

Ira S. Cohen; B.A., Arizona, 1949; M.A., Chicago, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Congressional Attitudes Toward the Soviet Union, 1917–1941. *Chicago.*

Anatol Dinbergs; M. Ll., University of Latvia, 1937; Ph.D., Georgetown, 1953. Incorporation of Latvia into the U.S.S.R., 1940–1941. *Georgetown.*

Herbert Walter Dowd; Ph.B., Muhlenberg College, 1943; A.M., Fletcher School, 1947; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. Non-White Land and Labor Policies in South West Africa from 1918–1948. *Fletcher School.*

Stanley W. Dziuban; B.S., United States Military Academy, 1939; A.M., Columbia, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. United States-Canadian Military Cooperation. *Columbia.*

Charles Pastene Edwards; B.S., Bowdoin College, 1941; A.M., Fletcher School, 1946; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. The Western League Powers and the Italo-Ethiopian Affair. *Fletcher School.*

Nasrollah Saifpour Fatemi; B.A., St. Memorial College, Iran, 1931; M.A. Columbia Univ., 1951; Ph.D. *New School*, 1955. The Case of Anglo-Iranian Oil Dispute. *New School.*

Mark Cecil Feer; A.B., Dartmouth, 1949; A.M., Fletcher School, 1951; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. India's Policy toward China since 1949. *Fletcher School.*

J. Arthur Funston; A.B., DePauw, 1938; A.M., Harvard, 1939; Ph.D., Indiana, 1955. The Definition of an International Bill of Human Rights. *Indiana.*

Tesfay Gebre-egziabhier; A.B., Stanford, 1950; A.M., Fletcher School, 1952; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Attainment of Self-Government under Chapter XI of the U. N. Charter, Cessation of Information Pursuant to Article 73 (e) of the U. N. Charter. *Fletcher School.*

Walter Samuel Gerst-Kohn; B.S., Univ. of London, 1947; M.A. Grad. Fac. 1949; Ph.D., *New School*, 1954. The North Atlantic Treaty. *New School.*

Omar Ghobashy; A.M., New York University, 1953; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Egypt's Attitude Toward International Law as Expressed in the United Nations. *New York University.*

Edward Glick; B.A., Brooklyn, 1950; M.A., Florida, 1952; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. The Policies of the Latin-American Governments toward Israel in the United Nations. *Florida.*

Stephen Gorove; LL.D., University of Budapest, 1939; LL.M., Yale, 1951; J.S.D., *ibid.*, 1952; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Power Politics Around the Iron Curtain; The Case of the Danube River. *Yale.*

James Warren Gould; A.B., Pennsylvania, 1946; A.M., Fletcher School, 1947; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. American Interests in Sumatra, 1784 to 1873. *Fletcher School.*

Merle L. Gulick; B.A., DePauw, 1945; M.A., Georgetown, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Tom Connally as a Founder of the United Nations. *Georgetown.*

Joseph Hajda; A.B., Miami (Ohio), 1951; A.M., *ibid.*, 1952; Ph.D., Indiana, 1955. Central European Federation. *Indiana.*

William Hamilton; B.A., Yale, 1947; M.A., *ibid.*, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Making Foreign Policy in Pressure Groups. *Yale.*

Donald R. Harris; B.S., California (Berkeley), 1939; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Economic Cooperation in Western Europe, 1920–1952. *California* (Berkeley).

Eugene Spencer Haugse; A.B., Nebraska, 1946; M.A., *ibid.*, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Alliances in International Relations Since 1920. *Nebraska.*

Frederick Herman; A.B., William and Mary, 1948; A.M., Fletcher School, 1949; M.A.L.D., *ibid.*, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. The Victors and the Vanquished: The Quest for Security as Illustrated by the Three Allied Occupations of Territory of the Defeated Power—France, 1815–1818; Germany, 1918–1929; and Germany, 1945—. *Fletcher School.*

James E. Hewes; B.A., Yale, 1943; M.A., *ibid.*, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. William E. Borah's Mirror of the World. *Yale.*

Raul Hilberg; A.B., Brooklyn, 1948; A.M., Columbia, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Prologue to Annihilation: A Study of the Identification, Impoverishment, and Isolation of Jewish Victims of Nazi Policy. *Columbia.*

Harold K. Jacobson; B.A., Michigan, 1950; M.A., Yale, 1952; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. The Soviet Union and the Economic and Social Activities of the United Nations. *Yale.*

Charles T. Katsainos; Licence ès Sciences Politiques, Licence ès Sciences Econonomiques, University of Lausanne, 1933; Ph.D., Georgetown, 1951. The Theory and Practice of Russian Panslavism in the Light of Russia's Expansion in the Balkans Until 1912. *Georgetown.*

Lu-yu Kiang; A.B., Hang Chow Christian College, 1939; A.M., Michigan, 1948; Ph.D., New York University, 1955. A Critical Study of the Operation of the UN Trusteeship System with Special Reference to the Methods of Supervision over the Administering Authorities. *New York University.*

Edward Darrel Lyle Killen; B.A., University of Sydney, 1949; B.A., Oxford University, 1950; Ph.D., Chicago, 1954. Pacific Security Alternatives as Seen Through Australian Eyes. *Chicago.*

Alvin Knepper; A.B., Ursinus College, 1949; A.M., New York University, 1950; Ph.D. *ibid.*, 1954. John Gilbert Winant and International Social Justice. *New York University.*

Jiri Liska; Dr. Juris, Charles University, Prague, 1948; Ph.D., Harvard, 1955. The Multiple Equilibrium: A Theory of Interntional Organization of Collective Security. *Harvard.*

William S. McCrea; B.A., Idaho, 1936; Ph.D., Georgetown, 1955. A Comparative Study of the Mexican Oil Expropriation (1938) and the Iranian Oil Nationalization (1951). *Georgetown.*

John A. Marcum; A.B., Stanford, 1949; M.A., Columbia, 1951; Ph.D., Stanford, 1955. French North Africa in the Atlantic Community. *Stanford.*

John Leslie Martin; B.A., American University, Cairo, Egypt, 1947; M.A., Minnesota, 1951; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. Legal and Diplomatic Control of International Propaganda. *Minnesota.*

Laurence Martin; B.A., Cambridge University, 1948; M.A., Yale, 1951; M.A., Cambridge University, 1952; Ph.D., Yale, 1955. Anglo-American Liberalism and the Allied Peace Program. *Yale.*

Gregory Meiksins; Univ. of Latvia; Ph.D., 1954. The Doctrine of Coexistence in Soviet Diplomacy. *New School.*

Irene W. Meister; A.B., Indiana, 1948; A.M., *ibid.*, 1949; Ph.D., Fletcher School, 1954. Soviet Policy in Iran, 1917–1950. *Fletcher School.*

Earl Thomas Millen; B.A., Washington (Seattle), 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. The Impact of Tensions Upon International Relations and Organization. *Washington* (Seattle).

John P. Mitchell; S.B., Boston University, 1951; M.A., *ibid.*, 1953; Ph.D., Chicago, 1955. America's Liberian Policy. *Chicago.*

Alfred G. Obern; A.B., Principia College, 1947; M.A., American, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. International Regional Organizations: A Study in International Administration. *American.*

William V. O'Brien; B.S.F.S., Georgetown, 1946; M.S.F.S., *ibid.*, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Military Necessity—The Development of Military Necessity and its Interpretation in the Modern Law of War. *Georgetown.*

Roy Olton; A.B., Ohio Wesleyan, 1947; A.M., Fletcher School, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1954. Problems of American Foreign Relations in the African Area during the Nineteenth Century. *Fletcher School.*

John Preston Rudy; A.B., DePauw, 1951; A.M., Fletcher School, 1952; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1955. Anglo-American Diplomatic Relations with Argentina, 1945–1954. *Fletcher School.*

Cyrus B. Samii; A.B., University of Teheran, 1948; M.A., Michigan, 1950; M.A., Oklahoma A. & M., 1951; Ph.D., Kansas, 1955. The Abrab-Asian Bloc in the United Nations. *Kansas.*

Donald George Smith; B.S., Oregon, 1947; M.S., *ibid.*, 1949; Ph.D., Minnesota, 1954. The Status of the Inhabitants of the Trust Areas: A Legal, Social, Economic and Political Study. *Minnesota.*

Cummins Speakman; B.A., Virginia, 1947; M.A., *ibid.*, 1948; Ph.D., Yale, 1955. An Investigation of American Official Information on Political Extremism in Germany During the Weimar Period with Special Emphasis on the First Six Years (1918–1924) and the Final Phase (1930–1933). *Yale.*

Robert B. Stauffer; B.S., State Teachers College, West Chester, Pa., 1942; M. Mus. Ed., Oklahoma, 1945; M.A., *ibid.*, 1947; Ph.D., Minnesota, 1954. Manchuria as a Political Entity: Government and Politics of a Major Region of China, Including its Relation to China Proper. *Minnesota.*

Phillips Talbot; A.B., Illinois, 1936; B.S., *ibid.*, 1936; Ph.D., Chicago, 1954. The Foreign Policy of India Since Independence. *Chicago.*

Urban Whitaker; B.A., Occidental College, 1947; Ph.D., Washington (Seattle), 1954. A Description of American Influences in Chinese Political Thinking: 1911–1923. *Washington* (Seattle).

BOOK REVIEWS, NOTES, AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ARTICLES 828

A Survey of Materials for the Study of Military Management. PAUL P. VAN RIPER 828

REVIEWS OF BOOKS 851

Cook and Moos, Power through Purpose: The Realism of Idealism as a Basis for Foreign Policy; *Marshall*, The Limits of Foreign Policy; *Halle*, Civilization and Foreign Policy: An Inquiry for Americans; *Finletter*, Power and Policy: U.S. Foreign Policy and Military Power in the Hydrogen Age; *Kennan*, Realities of American Foreign Policy. McGEORGE BUNDY 851

A Report on the Behavioral Sciences at the University of Chicago; The Behavioral Sciences at Harvard; Survey of the Behavioral Sciences (Michigan); The University of North Carolina Survey of Behavioral Science, 1953–1954; The Stanford Survey of the Behavioral Sciences, 1953–1954. ARTHUR W. MACMAHON 857

Berger, Abel, and Page (eds.), Freedom and Control in Modern Society. PETER H. ODEGARD 863

Lewis, Medieval Political Ideas. H. A. ROMMEN 866

Beaney, The Right of Counsel in American Courts. JOHN H. FERGUSON 868

Rostow, Hatch, Kierman, and Eckstein, The Prospects for Communist China. ROBERT C. NORTH 869

Leites, A Study of Bolshevism; *Leites and Bernaut*, Ritual of Liquidation: The Case of the Moscow Trials. PHILLIP E. MOSELY 870

Macmahon (ed.), Federalism: Mature and Emergent. HARVEY C. MANSFIELD 872

Anderson, The Nation and States, Rivals or Partners? CHARLES AIKIN 874

BOOK NOTES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY 876

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS 876

FOREIGN AND COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT 888

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND RELATIONS 900

POLITICAL THEORY, RESEARCH, AND METHODOLOGY 915

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ARTICLES

A SURVEY OF MATERIALS FOR THE STUDY OF MILITARY MANAGEMENT*

For a professional group whose main concern is frequently announced as "the problem of political power," American political scientists have paid astonishingly little attention to the main instrument of American political power—our armed forces. We have to some extent considered the influence of the military upon foreign policy and upon our traditional democratic institutions, but our neglect of the mechanics of internal management, which are to a considerable extent responsible for the powerful organizational momentum of the military establishment, could, until World War II, only be termed monumental.

While since 1940 there has been an increasing interest among political scientists in *military management*—the term used in this survey, for reasons indicated later, to designate that segment of public administration which relates to the military—there is much yet to be done; and there are cogent reasons for expanding our research activities in this direction. Above all there is the problem of the overwhelming size and cost of the military establishment. Such a leviathan needs critical analysis not only to acquaint us with the details of its inner workings and the possible trends of its development and influence but also to provide a leaven of criticism from without. As Maj. Gen. Otto L. Nelson, Jr., stated before the 1948 annual meeting of the American Political Science Association: "Too often in the past, the subject of organization for national defense has been regarded as primarily a technical problem for the military. . . . Nothing could be more unfortunate. Not only is the problem essentially political, rather than military, but it is one which, in light of our present situation, cannot and should not be left to the military alone." (*The Impact of Foreign Commitments on the Organization for National Defense,* p. 1.)

Beyond the need for constructive criticism of the military establishment, there is also the need to learn from military managerial experience. Military management represents our most systematic attempt to rationalize administration, public or private, and in neglecting it we may well have been neglecting the most fruitful source of managerial concepts and ideas available within the broad stream of American administrative experience. One can only note with concern, therefore, that none of the current texts in public administration makes more than a gesture toward the problems of military management or toward the comparison of civilian and military techniques of administration. John D. Millett's *Management in the Public Service* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1954) is more helpful on this score than similar works, but on the whole our

---

* So many organizations and individuals have assisted the author that credit cannot be given to all of them by name. However, the author wishes especially to recognize the continued assistance and encouragement of various members of the Office of the Chief of Military History, Department of the Army; as well as, during the early stages of the research, the financial assistance of the Social Science Research Council of Northwestern University.

graduate students must fend for themselves if they wish to comprehend the largest single segment of American public administrative activity.

One of the major barriers to scholarly analyses of military affairs is the lack of general knowledge among political and other social scientists of the available research materials. The purpose of this survey is broadly to consider the problems of research into the military aspects of public administration and to lay out—primarily for the political scientist interested in public administration and public policy—some of the major sources of information.

This discussion will also supplement—from the standpoint of the internal rather than the external problems of the military—the 140-page pamphlet on *Civil-Military Relations: An Annotated Bibliography, 1940 to 1952* (Columbia University Press, New York, 1954), prepared under the auspices of the Social Science Research Council's committee on this subject, headed by William T. R. Fox. This important research aid was, in turn, designed to supplement the SSRC's 1940 bibliography, also entitled *Civil-Military Relations* (Public Administration Service, Chicago), which is still a major source of reference to World War I military materials.

I. SOME BASIC RESEARCH DIFFICULTIES

Research into military management is not a simple matter. Our delay in the development of monographic materials concerned with military management is probably as much the result of this fact as it is of our traditional unconcern with matters military.

Mass of Documentation. Perhaps the most dismaying prospect facing the researcher is the sheer mass of documentation awaiting him. For example, as of 1947 the records relating to World War II under the control of the Department of the Army alone were estimated by the Office of the Chief of Military History at better than 17,000 tons. By 1954 more than a million documents relating to the USAF and its predecessor organizations were in the archives of the USAF Historical Division.

Security Restrictions. A further difficulty is the problem of "security." For example, 65,000 of the National War College Library's nearly 400,000 items are classified. The security regulations are frequently such that the outsider cannot undertake research into many aspects of military management—especially those of a current nature—without carefully preparing his way. If one is a present or former member of the armed forces, his problem is simpler, but he must in any event be prepared to face the problem of security with reference not only to basic documents and source materials but also to his end product. As military agencies are making every effort to open up documents for scholarly perusal, there is a fairly wide range of material available to the competent civilian student of military affairs who knows what he wants and where to find it; but the researcher who simply wishes to explore the possibilities will find it difficult going. Even explorations may require clearances.

Semantics. Another but less insuperable problem is essentially semantic. Military terminology is frequently confusing to anyone without considerable military experience. Of special significance is the usual military definition of *administration*, for in the military this term normally refers only to military paperwork and supply activities as opposed to such other activities as planning, operations, and strategy and tactics. *Military management* is perhaps the best equivalent in military terminology for *public administration* as it is thought of in relation to civil agencies—hence its use in the title of this article and elsewhere. It is used here in the general sense in which Colonel John R. Beishline uses it in his *Military Management for National Defense* (Prentice-Hall, New York, 1950). But even the individual with military experience is likely to need to make frequent reference to the unofficial *New Military and Naval Dictionary* (Philosophical Library, New York, 1951), which contains 7,000 contemporary definitions of terms used in all services, or to one of the several official military guides to terms, abbreviations, and symbols, reference to which can be made through official publications indexes cited later.

Scarcity of Indexes. An equal obstacle to research is the relative scarcity of adequate indexes to military literature, and particularly periodical literature. Existing indexes will be described later in this article, but there is no military equivalent of, for example, the *Reader's Guide.* This situation is gradually improving, however, and some assistance can now be obtained through the use of an increasing number of partial indexes and guides.

Professional Requirements. Competent research into military affairs is not to be expected from amateurs. Kent R. Greenfield, the Army's Chief Historian, in a short mimeographed release distributed at the 1948 annual meeting of the American Political Science Association ("Opportunities for Research in the Records of the Department of the Army," Office of the Chief of Military History, Washington, 1947), warns, in terms which are equally applicable to the Air Force and the Navy, that:

> the inadvisability of the use of the great mass of records by persons untrained in the problems of modern historical research, or not well-grounded in their special field of investigation, must be made clear. . . . The Historical Division is not equipped to provide adequate archival service except for its own writers. It cannot, therefore, devote any great amount of time to aiding visiting students in their research. Further, those who will use classified records must know exactly for what they are looking, in order to see them or have them declassified. . . . The opportunity for scholarly research in military institutions is unique, but it also challenges the resourcefulness and skill of the scholarly investigator.

For further illumination on these and related matters the cogent little volume containing the substance of three of Greenfield's lectures before the College of Puget Sound in 1953 and published under the title of *The Historian and the Army* (Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, 1954) is a "must." No other available publication so well outlines the sweep and magnitude of the problems facing the analyst of relatively contemporary military history.

Unfortunately, many political scientists have not been well-grounded in history and historical method, and the author has been informed by those who should know that this is one of the reasons for a paucity of political scientists in the military history programs—even though large segments of these involve essentially managerial matters. What is most needed for research into military organization and management are individuals who can to some extent match the civilian historians in their understanding of history and historical method, and who can also add to their analyses of military problems the penetration of minds trained in the problems of comparative administration—a thorough understanding of which is frequently lacking in the training of both professional military men and historians.

II. BACKGROUND MATERIALS

Assuming a researcher wishes to ground himself—in a general rather than a specialized fashion—in American military management, where should he start? Unfortunately there is no single work which will suffice for an "introduction." Therefore the following suggestions are made, in full realization that many will challenge the author's preferences.

Introductory Items. For a general historical introduction one might well start with either or both of two works. Cyril Falls' *A Hundred Years of War* (Duckworth, London, 1953 and Macmillan, New York, 1954) represents an unusually successful attempt to present in a single volume many of the most important military developments from 1850 to 1950. However, as Falls' primary interest appears to be with the more purely military aspects of warfare, he does not treat many of its broader implications. Of a somewhat different sort, and originally designed for use in the new military history program pioneered at Princeton under a Rockefeller grant, is the collection of materials edited by Gordon B. Turner and titled *A History of Military Affairs in Western Society since the Eighteenth Century* (Harcourt Brace, New York, 1953). Prepared by Turner with the guidance of an advisory committee consisting of Gordon A. Craig, Wesley F. Craven, and Jeter A. Isely, the selections represent 60 major writers whose contributions relate to the politics and economics of warfare, strategy and tactics, logistics, administrative problems, utilization of manpower, combined operations, and the like. A revision of a 1952 edition, the volume supplements that of Falls in its emphasis on the political and economic aspects of warfare. This volume is a landmark for the teaching of military history and is the first such work of importance since the publication in 1929 of Robert G. Albion's *Introduction to Military History* (Century, New York), a volume which is still useful, especially for its extensive bibliography. Finally, there is the enormously suggestive examination of the relationships between military organization and social structure by Stanislaw Andrzejewski in his *Military Organization and Society* (Grove Press, New York, 1954). Such a work should be undertaken only after a perusal of one of the more traditional treatments listed above, but the author's wide-ranging analysis of the problem of military organization and power and its effects upon societies will give the reader some hypotheses—frequently arguable—around which to develop his critical thinking.

Classical Works. By this time one should be ready for some of the "classical" works on the art and science of war, the philosophy of warfare, and the principles of war and strategy. These studies range from the works of Machiavelli down to such well-known analyses as Alfred T. Mahan's *The Influence of Sea Power upon History, 1660–1783* (Little, Brown, Boston, 1890) and Karl von Clausewitz' *On War* (new ed., trans. by O. S. Matthijs Jolles, Infantry Journal, Washington, 1950), and backward to the works of Thucydides, Sun Tzu, and Caesar. Almost any military bibliography of any scope will contain references not only to these students of military affairs but also to the names of J. F. C. Fuller, Ferdinand Foch, Henry Jomini, Colmar von der Goltz, Ardant du Picq, Giulio Douhet, Charles De Gaulle, Alfred von Schlieffen, Bronsart von Schellendorff, Emory Upton, Basil H. Liddell-Hart, and a number of others. These men are the "stars" of military theory and philosophy—with writings and concepts applicable not only to strategy and tactics but also to matters of organization and administration. Of the group, perhaps von Clausewitz is best known, but each of them has his ardent devotees. For an introduction to the writings of many of these men, see Edward M. Earle, ed., *Makers of Modern Strategy: Military Thought from Machiavelli to Hitler* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1943).

History of American Military Institutions. For the pre-World War II history of American military institutions one might begin with Fletcher Pratt's *A Short History of the Army and Navy* (Infantry Journal, Washington, 1944). This could be supplemented from the Army and Air Force side by William A. Ganoe's *History of the U.S. Army* (Appleton, New York, 1924), Oliver L. Spaulding's *United States Army in War and Peace* (Putman, New York, 1937), or John McAuley Palmer's *America in Arms* (Infantry Journal, Washington, 1943); and from the Navy side by Harold H. and Margaret Sprout's *Rise of American Naval Power, 1776–1918* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, rev. ed., 1942) and *Toward a New Order of Sea Power: American Naval Policy and the World Scene, 1918–1922* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1940), D. W. Mitchell's *History of the Modern American Navy from 1883 through Pearl Harbor* (Knopf, New York, 1946), or D. W. Knox' *A History of the United States Navy* (Putnam, New York, 1948). For the only equivalent work oriented toward our modern Air Force, see the controversial appraisal of *U. S. Military Doctrine* (Duell, Sloan and Pearce; Little, Brown; New York and Boston, 1955), by Brigadier General Dale O. Smith, USAF.

Recommended as a guide to more detailed information for this period, though not limited to it, is the 34-page bibliographical appendix to the excellent Department of the Army Pamphlet No. 20-200, *Guide to the Writing of American Military History* (G.P.O., Washington, 1951), prepared by the Office of the Chief of Military History for the guidance of Army historians. This bibliography is the best general bibliography on American military affairs—though it emphasizes the Army development—which has come to the attention of the author. It also has the advantage of being relatively easily accessible, since a preliminary edition of this pamphlet was considered sufficiently important to be reprinted as the Spring, 1950 issue of *Military Affairs* (Vol. 14). The chapter on "Libraries and Archives: How to Use Them" is invaluable. A reprinting of this manual is anticipated for 1955, and it is expected to contain a recommended reading list for officers. From an analytical point of view, though its bibliography is only moderately helpful, the syllabus entitled *War and National Policy* (Farrar and Rinehart, New York, 1942), edited by Grayson Kirk and Richard P. Stebbins, is more useful.

For the period since 1940 one should first consult the listings in the annotated bibliography on *Civil-Military Relations,* cited earlier, paying special attention to the items in Part II, "Defense Management," and Part IV, "Human and Material Resource Allocation." Among the many listings, those by or concerning Admirals King and Sims; Generals Marshall, Arnold, Nelson, Kenney, and Brereton; Secretaries Stimson and Forrestal; Colonels Beishline, Hittle, and Leigh; and by other analysts such as Read, Ballantine, Connery, Draper, Miller, Worsley, and Yoshpe are recommended. These may be digested along with the frequently highly illuminating reports and publications —many of which are cited in the bibliography referred to above—of congressional committees, the Bureau of the Budget (see especially its history of civil governmental operations in World War II, *The United States at War*, G.P.O., Washington, 1946), and the first Hoover commission. A general overview of the events of World War II can probably best be obtained through study of T. Dodson Stamps' and Vincent J. Esposito's (eds.) *A Military History of World War II* (West Point, New York, 1953, 2 vols. and atlas), the only available compendium of World War II military history, or through one or more of the official war histories of the defense services, about which more will be said later.

Organization. For a stimulating though controversial study of American, and to some extent comparative, military organization and administration, made by a somewhat dogmatic student of organization, better known for his work in the field of business administration, see Alvin Brown's *The Armor of Organization* (Hibbert, New York, 1953). Although inflexible on a number of matters, this is nevertheless, except for the reports of official commissions, the only comprehensive analysis of military management involving all three major services. The two principal studies of the American general staff concept—Otto Nelson's *National Security and the General Staff* (Infantry Journal, Washington, 1946) and J. D. Hittle's *The Military Staff: Its History and Development* (Military Service Publishing Co., Harrisburg, Pa., rev. ed., 1949)—have recently been supplemented by an American Management Association publication (General Management Series, No. 165, 1953) by Lyndall F. Urwick and Ernest Dale, *Profitably Using the General Staff Position in Business.* This 35-page pamphlet is especially useful for its attempt to disengage staff-line concepts from their current semantic morass and is further evidence of the interest of the business world in military organizational techniques. For other references to organizational systems and doctrine within the military, see especially the citations in Section V of this survey.

Logistics. "Logistics" is a special military term which, as Army Field Manual 100-10 (1949) has defined it, "envisages getting the right people and the appropriate supplies to the right place at the right time and in the proper condition" (p. 367), although more current doctrine tends to de-emphasize the reference to personnel. Traditionally it is a broad term encompassing the procurement, supply, and distribution activities of the military together with large portions of the financial and personnel activities. Since 1952 three works of unusual importance have appeared to illuminate these matters. The most specialized of these—supplementing Elias Huzar's trail blazing study, *The Purse and the Sword* (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1950)—is Frederick C. Mosher's *Program Budgeting: Theory and Practice* (Public Administration Service, Chicago, 1954). While Mosher's study relates primarily to the Army, it is also to some extent a comparative study of the services. It shows clearly how difficult it is under present political and appropriation policies to coordinate the long-range financial and program planning activities of the military. The web of financial and cost accounting controls now developing within the military, though partially illumined by the pioneer efforts of Mosher, needs much more analysis.

On procurement, supply, and distribution there is, in addition to the specialized studies of particular military agencies such as the Quartermaster Corps or the Bureau of Ordnance, to be referred to later, the important study of *The Organization and Role of the Army Service Forces* by John D. Millett (G.P.O., Washington, 1954). Millett served on the staff of Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, the commanding general of the ASF, and during World War II was the historian of the ASF, the most controversial of the three top-level operating agencies established by the War Department in 1942, the other two being the Army Air Forces and the Army Ground Forces. Much more of a personal history than other Army military histories, the volume suffers to some extent from this fact but has gained from Millett's close association with the subject at hand. While the ASF was disbanded at the end of the war, its story becomes more important when one realizes that in the summer of 1954 what is in effect a new ASF was created. On this development see Lt. Gen. W. B. Palmer's short but useful discussion of "The Evolution of Management for Logistics," *Combat Forces Journal*, Vol. 5, pp. 22–24 (Feb., 1955).

Millett's study also throws some light on the problems of civilian as opposed to military supply during time of war, particularly on the quarrels between the War Production Board and the armed services over procurement policies. However, the second edition of a 1950 publication, *Economics of National Security*, prepared by George A. Lincoln and his associates at the U.S. Military Academy (Prentice-Hall, New York, 1954), offers a much more complete presentation of the problem of management of economic resources under the cold-war conditions of today. This is not a highly theoretical work, but it is a most practical one in its definition of the problem and its discussions of developments during and since World War II. Not only does the study consider some of the overall economic problems involved in the security effort, but also such subordinate managerial problems as manpower control, industrial mobilization, procurement, transportation, financial stabilization, raw material strategy, economic warfare, and mutual assistance. In its chapters on "The National Security Council," "The National Security Resources Board," and "The Emergency Mobilization Agencies," Edward H. Hobbs' *Behind the President: A Study of Executive Office Agencies* (Public Affairs Press, Washington, 1954) provides supplementary reading.

Strategy and Tactics. Here one should refer first to the classical writers mentioned earlier and to some of the publications cited in Sections IV, V and VI. Relatively new applications of scientific research techniques to all sorts of managerial matters—both business and governmental—including especially strategy and tactics, are represented by "operations research," another managerial technique which first proved itself in the military. Those who wish to orient themselves in this approach would do well to start with John McDonald's *Strategy in Poker, Business, and War* (Norton, New York, 1950) or J. D. Williams' *The Compleat Strategyst* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1954). However, these two books emphasize game theory, which represents only one aspect of operations research; they should be followed by the more complete *Operations Research for Management* (Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1954), edited by Joseph F. McCloskey and Florence N. Trefethen of the Army-sponsored Operations Research Office of The Johns Hopkins University.

Civil-Military Relations. While this discussion is not oriented toward the external relationships of the military, nevertheless the impact of civil-military relationships is felt within the military as well as within the civil establishment. Since the publication of the bibliography on *Civil-Military Relations*, cited earlier, two helpful items have appeared. The most important for our purposes here is by Burton M. Sapin and Richard C. Snyder, *The Role of the Military in American Foreign Policy* (Doubleday, Garden City, 1954). One of the Doubleday Short Studies in Political Science, this booklet covers such topics as "The Expanded Role of the Military," "Military Organization for Foreign-Policy-Making," and "Military Participation in Foreign-Policy-Making," together with a consideration of the proper role of the military in such matters. There is also a useful two-page bibliography. The other item, which covers some of the same ground, is an issue of the *Journal of International Affairs* (Vol. 8, No. 2, 1954) devoted entirely to the topic of "The Military and U.S. Foreign Policy Planning." In six individual articles such matters as "The National Security Council: Concept of Operation; Organization; Actual Operations"; "Military-Civilian Relations in the Occupation of Japan and Korea"; and "Radicalism and Conservatism in National Defense Policy" are considered. The Doubleday item and the *Journal* symposium admirably supplement each other and, if read with Louis Smith's *American Democracy and Military Power* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1951), the standard work on the problem of the proper relationship of military to civilian power, should provide a grasp of most of the politico-military problems confronting us today.

A survey of current research in civil-military relations is given by William T. R. Fox, "Civil-Military Relations Research," *World Politics*, Vol. 6, pp. 278–88 (Jan., 1954). The basic monographic literature necessary for more definitive studies has been lacking; the program of grants to individuals for research in the history of military policy, initiated by the Social Science Research Council in the autumn of 1954, is intended to meet this need.

Law. Finally, there are the matters of law and legal precedent. The most definitive analysis of the powers of the President is still that of Edward S. Corwin, *The President: Office and Powers* (New York University Press, New York, 3d rev. ed., 1948). Of special interest here are the discussions in Chaps. 4 and 6, the former dealing in part with the subject of martial law and the latter with the "Commander-in-Chief in Wartime." Also of special interest is the monograph by Clinton L. Rossiter, *The Supreme Court and the Commander-in-Chief* (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1951). Neither of these works nor the standard texts in public law, however, deal much with the administration of justice within the military—with "military law and justice," as it is usually termed—for which there is a separate constitutional legal system. Perhaps the best guide now available—though much of it is quite technical—is *Military Law under the Uniform Code of Military Justice*, by William B. Aycock and Seymour W. Wurfel (University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1955). Especially useful is the first chapter, concerning "Historical Background." Last of all, there is the special problem of the "laws of war," which involves such matters as the Hague conventions. A useful digest and bibliography on this subject is contained in the 1949 revision of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* under the heading, "Laws of War." Beyond the above items, there are all the federal laws and regulations affecting the defense agencies, the reports of the Judge Advocate General, quantities of hearings and legislative debates, court decisions, and other sources, access to which can be obtained through the standard legal and legislative guides.

III. ARCHIVAL AND OTHER BASIC INDEXES

In this section the major general and special guides and indexes to sources such as archives, military periodicals, military books and pamphlets, official military publications, and special library collections, are considered.

Archives. The archival problem is, of course, immense, but two major guides are available. The first is the National Archives compilation, *Federal Records of World War II* (G.P.O., Washington, 1951), prepared under the direction of Philip M. Hamer. This publication is in two volumes, the first concerning "Civilian Agencies" (1073 pages, including a brief name index), and the second concerning "Military Agencies" (1061 pages, including a 218-page consolidated subject matter and name index for both volumes). Not only does this monumental work describe the archival collections in as much detail as is now possible—including agency, current disposition of records, the general contents of the records, and the prospects of access—but it also contains brief and invaluable summaries of the organization and functions of the great number of wartime agencies, both civilian and military. In addition, these volumes are constantly being supplemented by more detailed inventories, special lists, and other finding aids.

A similiar National Archives publication is available for World War I, the *Handbook of Federal World War Agencies and Their Records: 1917–1921* (G.P.O., Washington, 1943). Unlike the two volumes cited above, this 666-page indexed publication contains, in addition to the usual archival information, detailed bibliographies relating to federal agency operations during World War I. For other archival publications of use to the student of military management one should check the publications list of the National Archives, which is obtainable directly from that agency. One of the more useful items, for example, is Reference Information Paper No. 43 (December, 1952), which outlines *Materials in the National Archives Relating to the Historical Programs of Civilian Governmental Agencies during World War II.* This pamphlet deals primarily with agencies especially created during the war for emergency purposes, and many of their historical materials relate directly to military problems. Its bibliographies supplement the 53-page *List of World War II Historical Studies Made by Civilian Agencies of the Federal Government* (G.P.O., Washington, 1951), prepared by the National Historical Publications Commission.

For still more published information, the researcher may consult the files of *The American Archivist;* for example, the April, 1954 issue (Vol. 17) of this journal contains a description of the USAF Historical Division Archives.

Periodicals. There is no definitive listing of what may be called "military periodicals" and few of them are indexed in the better known guides to periodical literature. However, a note in *Military Affairs,* Vol. 17, p. 190 (Winter, 1953), "A Survey of Military Periodicals," refers to a thesis of 360 pages which describes 89 military periodicals. Prepared by Captain Max L. Marshall, the thesis may be consulted in the University of Missouri Library. Evidently Captain Marshall prepared this list with the aid of the editors of *Military Affairs,* and the latter indicate that the thesis not only gives names and addresses of publishers, and other data, but also endeavors to describe in a general way both the flavor and typical content of the periodicals. Nevertheless, Captain Marshall's list does not exhaust the available periodicals; the present author has been able to develop a consolidated list of about 250 foreign and domestic military-oriented periodicals, but even this list is certainly not complete. For a brief guide to the periodicals most useful for insights into Army—and to some extent Air Force and Navy—matters, one may consult pages 98–99 of the Department of the Army Pamphlet No. 20-200, cited earlier. For selected lists of periodicals of particular value for their insights into air and naval managerial problems, the researcher is referred to the principal military libraries, discussed later. For general military management purposes, however, one may wish to check the new monthly periodical, *Armed Forces Management,* the first issue of which appeared in October, 1954. Beyond this, it is enough to say here that the military periodical press contains much of the most incisive and useful literature concerning both current and past military managerial problems, as well as frequent summaries and guides to a vast quantity of foreign and domestic military literature.

Indexes to Military Literature. The normal bibliographical indexes are useful but quite incomplete in their coverage of military materials, and there is no complete specialized index to all military literature. The following, as far as the author has been able to ascertain, comprise the entire group of publications which at all deserve to be termed indexes and which attempt to be comprehensive rather than specialized.

Probably the most important such index is the *National Defense Review*, published by the Army Library since 1947. Issues appear monthly and the periodical is now in its 16th volume, a volume comprising six issues, the last of which contains a cumulative author and subject listing. The *Review* covers, in addition to general information on other military operations, materials having a direct bearing on the defense departments and all segments thereof. Scientific and technical matters are, however, excluded. It attempts to supplement about 30 current bibliographies which are listed in the introduction. The January, 1955 issue, for example, indexes 550 items, including articles from 126 foreign and domestic periodicals. A total of 800 periodicals are screened regularly for the selection of pertinent papers. The *Review* also covers miscellaneous types of all sorts of publications emanating from within and without the military establishment and not normally cataloged elsewhere. The publication is especially useful in that it not only indexes the items but also abstracts them briefly. Unfortunately, however, the *Review* has been a classified publication, the first five volumes having been marked "confidential" and the remainder having been "restricted" in one way or another, with the present classification being that of "confidential—modified handling authorized."

Then there is the *Periodical Index* of the Air University Library, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, which has been published for about as long as the *Review*. Though each of these guides inclines toward its own service, both are exceedingly broad in their coverage and contain items relating to the entire military establishment. The *Periodical Index* is published quarterly with yearly cumulations and there is a single cumulative issue of 419 pages for the period from October, 1949 through December, 1952. More than 50 periodicals are indexed under subject headings.

Primarily for the Navy, though no more parochial in coverage than the others, are two publications of the Naval War College, Newport, R.I. The first is its *Library Bulletin*, a bi-weekly mimeographed publication of from 10 to 15 pages indexing periodical articles from a wide range of civilian and military publications under subject matter headings, along with books and pamphlets listed alphabetically by author only. This guide is essentially an accessions list —though more useful than most—for the Naval War College Library. As of January, 1955, this publication had reached issue No. 435. Unfortunately, this is not a cumulative publication. However, supplementing the *Library Bulletin* is a selective mimeographed publication known as *Evaluations of Library Material*. Periodically since 1947 the Naval War College library has published through this medium evaluations by naval personnel of periodical articles as well as books and pamphlets. The evaluations are essentially critical annotations of selected items originally listed in the *Bulletin;* for the period from

August, 1947 through June, 1952, they have been cumulated under the title *Staff Evaluations of Library Accessions,* in a single 427-page volume with a composite name and subject index. In addition the items themselves are segregated under 27 major headings varying from "Africa" through "Psychological Warfare" to "World War II." A similar cumulation exists for the period from September, 1952 through June, 1953.

Also useful, though not cumulated in published form, is the *Periodical Literature Bulletin* of the National War College Library, Washington. Usually published weekly in mimeographed form since July, 1947, it indexes articles selected from its larger, though unpublished, selective card index to journal articles in the broad field of military and political affairs. The latter index, which covers some 400 journals, may be used at the Library and is supplemented by another index, more purely military in its emphasis, to periodical articles covering a period from before World War I to June 30, 1947 and consisting of over 100,000 cards. The *Bulletin* has been supplemented regularly by another mimeographed publication known as *Book News,* which indexes, though not cumulatively, selected acquisitions. However, circulation of these issuances is limited to official agencies. Those who cannot obtain access to these materials should consult the various issues of the principal journal devoted to military history, *Military Affairs,* the "Military Library" section of which consists of a wide-ranging selection of current books and periodical articles, prepared and to some extent indexed and annotated through the efforts of George J. Stansfield, reference librarian at the National War College.

Finally, for materials relating to naval management (there is no equivalent for the Army or Air Force), one should not fail to consult the most complete bibliography on maritime and naval history now available, by Robert G. Albion, Gardiner Professor of Oceanic History and Affairs, Harvard University, *Maritime and Naval History: An Annotated Bibliography* (Published by the author, 1951). This 60-page bibliography—partially annotated—has in turn been supplemented since January, 1952 by a bibliographical section in each issue of *The American Neptune,* also compiled by Albion under the title "Recent Writings in Maritime History." The first two bibliographical sections were devoted to books and articles produced between 1945 and 1951; since then each issue deals with the writings of the previous quarter. The first ten issues (January, 1952–April, 1954) included 1,042 books and 2,411 articles from 309 different periodicals, compiled under 15 topical divisions varying from "Inland Navigation" to "Bibliographies."

Military Publications Systems. None of the indexes mentioned previously makes much if any reference to the official publications of the military agencies. Each of the services has its "official publications system" for internal coordination and information, consisting of regulations, field manuals, technical manuals, circulars, tables of organization and equipment, and similar administrative bulletins—publications which are numbered and distributed according to a systematic procedure, primarily designed to convey to subordinate units information concerning standard policies and practices.

Many of these publications are available in military libraries; many are indexed in the standard catalogs of the Superintendent of Documents; many are available in ROTC libraries; and some are issued on a regular basis to civilian depository libraries. Unfortunately most civilian depository libraries do not catalog these materials very well or completely; in some they are handled like ordinary books and pamphlets and housed among the usual non-military materials, but in others—and they are more usable this way by the systematic researcher—they are kept together somewhere in their numerical series, as they are normally kept in military agencies. In any event, one will not only want to consult the normal library catalogs and shelf lists, but also the following special military indexes to these publications, which are far more complete than the normal library card catalogs and which will give one a fuller idea of what to search for in the depository or other library collections.

In the Air Force the chief indexes to directives of general application are Air Force Regulations No. 5-2 and No. 5-3, the first a *Numerical Index to Air Force Standard Publications*, the second a *Subject Index to Administrative Publications*, both issued by the Air Adjutant General, Washington. These indexes and publications series are then supplemented by other series, issued by the principal Air Commands. For example, the Air Research and Development Command has its own ARDC Regulation No. 5-2, *Numerical Index of ARDC Regulations, Letters, and Manuals*, etc. The Air Force indexes are usually unclassified and, if one does not find them in his depository library (the typical situation), the nearest location where one may consult them can ordinarily be ascertained by writing to the Air Adjutant General. However, the researcher should keep in mind—for Army and Navy indexes also—that any particular issue of these indexes, which are frequently revised several times a year, covers only publications still in effect at the time of publication of the index. There are no cumulative indexes and only modest references to rescinded directives.

The equivalent Army index was contained, for a period after World War II, in the unclassified Field Manual 21-6, *List and Index of Department of the Army Publications*, normally issued quarterly. One or more issues of this manual will be found in many depository libraries and the manual is still useful. However, with the Korean conflict the Army changed its index publications system and raised the security classification to "restricted." Even though the current issues of Army official indexes are now unclassified, they are not generally distributed outside military channels. However, scholars who have good reason to consult these publications should experience no great difficulty, and should write to the Adjutant General, Department of the Army, Washington, for advice and information. One should inquire as to the availability of the No. 310 series of Department of the Army Pamphlets. As late as the summer of 1955, some of the Army's publications indexes were still in the form of Special Regulations (also of the 310 series). However, as the Army is gradually discontinuing its series of Special Regulations, these indexes are reappearing in the form and with the numbers of Department of the Army Pamphlets as rapidly as new editions are necessary. The full changeover should be complete by the end of 1955.

While the Army and Air Force publications systems are centrally organized through their respective Adjutants General, that of the Navy—including the Marine Corps and, in time of war, the Coast Guard—is directed by the Administrative Office, Department of the Navy. This office controls the over-all publications program but, in accord with traditional concepts of naval administration, permits the bureaus and offices of the Department considerable latitude. As a result, it is often more difficult for the researcher to deal with naval publications than with those of the other services. However, information on virtually all current Navy publications is available from the Publications Division of the Department's Administrative Office; and, particularly since May, 1952, the Navy has made considerable progress in developing a Navy Directives System for the easier identification of internal management issuances. For the basic regulations controlling Navy publications see the 17-page manual, *Rules, Regulations, Policies, and Standards for the Control of Navy Publications and Printing* (Department of the Navy, Washington, NAVEXOS P-35, rev. Nov., 1945). For an understanding of the new Directives System, see SECNAV Instruction 5215.1 on the subject of "The Navy Directives System" (Office of the Secretary, Department of the Navy, Washington, May 19, 1952). For an index to the Directives System see the current and preceding (back to July 1, 1952) issues of *Navy Directives System Consolidated Subject Index*, published semiannually by the Publications Division mentioned above. For the period between July 1, 1952 and June 1, 1942 the files and indexes of the *Navy Department Bulletin*, available for study in the same office, furnish a valuable cumulation of management material of sufficiently broad application to be published through that medium for the entire naval establishment.

In addition to the standard directives of the armed forces, there are the irregular and not always numbered publications often known as Technical Reports—stemming from research and development agencies, special boards and commissions, or defense research and other contractors. Fortunately, as many of these are of wide interest to social and other scientists, they are to a large extent collected, indexed, and occasionally supplied upon request by the Document Service Center, Armed Services Technical Information Agency (ASTIA), Knott Building, Dayton, Ohio. Also published periodically by ASTIA is *The Announcement Bulletin*, a bibliographical publication which lists unclassified materials and which continues a publication previously prepared by the Technical Information Division of the Library of Congress. There is also a classified edition of this publication.

Special Libraries. Some of these have already been mentioned, but there are many more, ranging into the hundreds. If one does not have available the counsel of a librarian versed in special libraries problems, he may wish to direct his inquiries to one or more of these military libraries: the Army Library, the Air University Library, the National War College Library, and the Navy Department Library. The locations of the first three have been given; the fourth is in the Main Navy Building, Department of the Navy, Washington. From these libraries one may receive further—though seldom definitive—advice on the library resources of the several military departments. However, there is no complete catalog of military special libraries and their major holdings, and the problem of utilizing their very great resources is difficult to solve. The most important ones for the student of military management, besides the four referred to above, are apt to be those associated with the various military educational institutions such as the Naval War College, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, the Army's Command and General Staff College, the Armed Forces Information School, the Infantry School, or the various military academies.

In 1953 a Military Librarians Section, affiliated with the Social Science Division of the Special Libraries Association, was organized. This group has plans for (1) the development of a Military Libraries Bibliographic Exchange Union centered at the Air University Library, (2) preparation of a Union List of Foreign Military Serials under the sponsorship of the Army Library, (3) promotion of the indexing of English language periodicals in military science, and (4) consideration of the problem of indexing foreign military periodicals. There is also an Armed Forces Librarians Section of the Public Libraries Division of the American Library Association, whose major efforts have been aimed at the improvement of the internal administration of military libraries. The Library Branch of the Special Services Division, Office of the Adjutant General of the Army, will soon publish a *Manual of Army Library Service.*

There also are special collections in many university and a few public libraries, of which the Library of Congress collection is, on the whole, the most important. Within the Library of Congress the activities of the Legislative Reference Service and the General Reference and Bibliography Division of the Reference Department have been the most important from the standpoint of military management. For example, the Legislative Reference Service published during part of World War II a series of selected and annotated *Bibliographies of the World at War,* aimed at providing a guide to materials published after April, 1941 which dealt with national defense and the war effort. With its periodic cumulations and supplements, this bibliography covers the period from April, 1941 through May, 1943. While not fully indexed, the materials cited are grouped under 10 major headings varying from "Political Developments and the War" to "Postwar Planning and Reconstruction." An example of the specialized work of the General Reference and Bibliography Division is the 75-page, annotated "Military Administration: A Partial Bibliography with Special Reference to the Unification of the Armed Services," compiled by Donald H. Mugridge in January, 1946 (typewritten).

Also of special significance is the unofficial collection of military unit histories at the New York Public Library, the most complete such collection in existence, which includes many foreign as well as American items. Unit histories are official or unofficial histories of individual military organizations such as divisions, regiments, companies, etc., and their contents, while not always unbiased, are frequently useful for the study of the problems of the smaller military units. With the assistance of C. E. Dornbusch and his aides at the New York Public Library, the Office of the Chief of Military History of the Army has produced a catalog of many of these unit histories titled *Unit Histories of World War II* (1950), for which a supplement was published in 1951. The basic listing, which includes many Air Force and Navy histories, is now out of print but the supplement is distributed by the Library Section, Special Services Division, Office of the Adjutant General, Department of the Army, as is a further publication titled *Unit Histories of World War II and After: United States Army* (1953). This agency also distributes monthly a further supplementary publication, reproduced from copy supplied by Dornbusch, known as *Unit Histories*. Beyond these guides, a new publication called *Histories of American Army Units, World Wars I and II and Korean Conflict, with Some Earlier Histories* is in the process of publication. Also compiled from copy supplied by Dornbusch is the *Post-War Souvenir Books and Unit Histories of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Construction Battalions* issued by the Office of Naval History in 1953. In addition to its unit histories the New York Public Library contains one of the outstanding general military collections in the world—including military books in all languages, periodicals, manuals, and related publications.

Other Special Guides and Indexes. Still of considerable use for research purposes is the series of *Official War Publications* (9 vols., 1941–45) prepared by Jerome K. Wilcox for the Bureau of Public Administration of the University of California at Berkeley, the first two volumes of which were designated as *Official Defense Publications*. Several of these volumes are still available through the Bureau and the set is occasionally found in the larger civilian and military libraries. The volumes are mimeographed with a printed cover; they vary from 106 to 236 pages in length. The entire set lists approximately 19,000 items, of which 655 are Canadian, 4,887 state, and 13,392 federal, from all types of civilian and military agencies for the period from 1941 through 1944. Materials are indexed by country, by state, and to a considerable extent by agency, particularly federal materials.

The bibliographical guides prepared by Dorothy C. Tompkins, also of the Bureau of Public Administration at Berkeley, are more recent though less comprehensive for purposes of this discussion. Her *Materials for the Study of Federal Government*, containing a number of entries for military and civil-military agencies, was published by the Public Administration Service, Chicago, in 1948. Her more recent guide, *National Defense in 1950—The Federal Program: A Specialized Bibliography*, was published in mimeographed form by the Bureau in November, 1950 and covers a wide variety of materials for the first ten months of 1950. Since 1940, the Bureau has published a number of other bibliographies concerning civil-military matters, a listing of which is contained on p. ii of Tompkins' 1953 bibliography on *Civil Defense in the States*.

The former Army Service Forces' *List and Index of Publications* (Washington, 1945, ASF Manual M800), although out of print, is a useful guide to

World War II logistical matters. Of interest to persons concerned with research and development management is the *Inventory of Technical Information Activities of the Department of Defense*, prepared by the Special Committee on Technical Information of the Defense Department's Research and Development Board (Washington, 1951, TI 202/6). While this 36-page publication is "restricted," an unclassified version was published in the December 21, 1951 issue of *Science.*

IV. OFFICIAL HISTORICAL PROGRAMS

Managerial history written under official governmental auspices is largely a development of World War II, resulting from need and encouraged by the personal interest of President Roosevelt. Today the principal military departments and agencies all have official historical programs and publications series. More and more the defense agencies have recognized that future action requires analysis of the past. Greenfield's book, cited earlier, outlines many of the developmental problems. Notwithstanding the seriousness of these problems, the progress of many of these programs has been remarkable and the publications comprise the most usable and useful secondary materials available to the student of military management for recent years.

The Army Program. The Army's historical program is under the direction of the Office of the Chief of Military History in Washington, and in terms of published volumes is the most impressive program among the services. Of most interest to political scientists are three series of volumes—the first dealing with World War I, the second with World War II, and the third with the Korean conflict. The first series consists largely of 17 volumes, primarily documentary, concerning the AEF, with the general title, *The United States Army in the World War, 1917–1919* (G.P.O., published between 1949 and 1951); this group of volumes has been supplemented by three additional volumes, *Order of Battle of the U. S. Land Forces in the World War, 1917–1919* (G.P.O., 1931–1950). The second series, under the general title, *The United States Army in World War II*, represents a projected program of about 90 volumes, of which approximately 75 have been published through the Government Printing Office or are in substantial progress. The third group of publications will consist of approximately ten volumes—half of them dealing with the military actions of the Korean conflict and the remainder with the concurrent national emergency effort. In addition, the Office of the Chief of Military History has prepared a wide range of special studies, pictorial volumes, special action studies, and reports, most of which are available through the Superintendent of Documents, along with the volumes cited above. For further information about these publications—as well as for information concerning its archives and collection of nearly 1,000 unpublished historical monographs, the bulk of which concern administrative and organizational problems—one should write directly to the Office of the Chief of Military History, Department of the Army, Washington.

The Air Force. While the Army historical publications have been prepared largely by writers and researchers employed directly by the Army and engaged on "official" works, those of the Air Force and Navy have been developed under more mixed auspices. The general nature of the Air Force program is outlined in Air Force Manual 210-1, *Manual for Air Force Historians* (Department of the Air Force, Washington, 1952); however, very little bibliographical information is contained in the manual. The principal Air Force series of histories is known as *The Army Air Forces in World War II*, edited by Wesley F. Craven and James L. Cate (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1948–date). Six of the seven projected volumes have already appeared. The first five cover operations for the period from January, 1939 through August, 1945. The sixth volume and the seventh, which is still in preparation, deal primarily with administration and logistics and special services such as the Air Transport Command. However, the program is not limited to this series. As with the Army, a large number of monographs and other types of publications have been prepared. For further information concerning this program and the voluminous records and manuscripts assembled, one should write to the USAF Historical Division, the Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama. There is also an Air University Historical Liaison Office in Washington.

The Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. The Navy's historical program is under the direction of the Naval History Division, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Department of the Navy, Washington. The general functions of this division are similar to those of the other historical agencies. Though there is now no manual for naval historians, the Naval History Division is in the process of preparing a publication to be called *Source Material for the History of the U. S. Navy during World War II: A Bibliography.* When available, this should be of considerable assistance to the student of naval management. The principal series of naval histories for our purposes here is the projected 14-volume analysis, *History of United States Naval Operations in World War II*, by Samuel Eliot Morison. More than half of the series has already been published through Little, Brown, and Company of Boston, with the final volume anticipated for 1959. Not an official product—though produced with official cooperation—this series is more personal in its analysis and approach than most of the other histories, and both gains and suffers from this fact. In addition to the Morison volumes, the Naval History Division has sponsored a considerable number of further studies, published under a variety of auspices; lists of these may be obtained from the Division. Unfortunately for the student of military management, the Navy and Air Force histories thus far published have paid relatively less attention to the organizational, logistical, and administrative aspects of military affairs than have the Army studies. As with the other historical agencies, the Naval History Division has a considerable quantity of archival materials, unpublished manuscripts, and other source materials under its control; access to these should be sought directly from the Division.

The efforts of the Historical Branch, G-3, Headquarters, United States Marine Corps, Department of the Navy, Washington, have largely been directed toward the preparation of historical monographs concerning particular actions or campaigns. To date approximately 15 such monographs have been prepared and issued through the Superintendent of Documents. References to these publications as well as to other Marine Corps publications can be obtained directly from the Historical Branch. An additional volume of more than ordinary interest, especially for its treatment of amphibious doctrine, techniques, and organization—the specialty of the Marine Corps—is *The U. S. Marines and Amphibious Warfare* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1951), by Jeter A. Isely and Philip A. Crowl.

The Coast Guard has also been developing a series of monographs under the general heading of the *Coast Guard at War*, the bulk of which are expected to appear in a one-volume edition to be published by the United States Naval Institute, Annapolis, Maryland, under the title of *History of the Coast Guard in World War II*. Meanwhile one may consult Stephen H. Evans' *The United States Coast Guard, 1790–1915* (U. S. Naval Institute, Annapolis, 1949), which also contains a postscript for the period from 1915 to 1949. Information concerning these and other Coast Guard historical publications may be obtained from the Historical Section, Public Information Division, U. S. Coast Guard, Washington. This agency also issues a general bibliography of Coast Guard materials in the form of a small printed booklet called *United States Coast Guard Bibliography*, the last edition with which the author is acquainted being for 1950 (CG-230).

Subordinate Programs. The historical agencies listed above can, of course, give the researcher information concerning not only their own central historical programs but also the numerous programs of subordinate units, some of which are of considerable importance and extent. Besides its four volume contribution to the series, *The United States Army in World War II*, the Historical Section in the Office of The Quartermaster General has completed more than 20 monographs under the general heading of *QMC Historical Studies*, an example of which is *Methods of Forecasting War Requirements for Quartermaster Supplies* (1946, No. 14). The Quartermaster School, Fort Lee, Virginia, has prepared a 10-volume series, *Quartermaster Supply in the European Theater of Operations in World War II* (1947–1949).

V. ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT IN THE MAJOR SERVICES

While all of the items already cited—especially those of Section II—deal to some extent with this topic, there are a few additional materials concerning each of the three major military services and their parent organization, the Department of Defense, in which the student of military management is likely to be interested.

The Air Force. Since the Air Force is the newest of the separate services, there is less written about it than the other services and the bibliographical literature is somewhat less adequate. However, for information concerning fundamental organizational and doctrinal theories—crucial to an understanding of military management in any of the services—one can refer to

Air Force Regulations and Air Force Manuals. For example, an understanding of AFR No. 20-1, *Organization-General: Organization Principles and Policies for the Air Force* (April 28, 1953), is essential to the study of the organizational theories upon which the Air Force is currently based. Air Force Manuals—for example, some of those in the 1, 25, 67, 172 and 400 series—are also a basic source of information concerning the rationale and organization of the Air Force. For secondary and a few primary materials, the various editions (eight up to date) of the *Professional Reading Guide for Air Force Officers*, prepared by the Air University and currently published as Air Force Pamphlet 36-5-1 (1954), are most useful, especially since the items are briefly annotated.

The Army. Still quite useful for its descriptive material is *The Army Almanac*, an official publication of 1009 pages prepared by the Armed Forces Information School (G.P.O., 1950), which is current as of October, 1948. Readings in this encyclopedia should be supplemented by more specific reference to Army Regulations and Special Regulations. Those of the 10 series are especially important for their relationship to Army organization, as are those of the 700 to 795 series for logistical information. From these one may turn to Army Field Manuals, particularly those in the 100 and 101 series concerning line-staff relationships, field organization and administration, and the Army planning system. FM 38-1, *Logistics Supply Management* (August, 1954), is also of special interest as the first comprehensive exposition of principles to guide the management of the Army's vast supply system. Among items cited earlier particular attention is directed to Department of the Army Pamphlet No. 20-200.

The Navy. A naval equivalent to *The Army Almanac* is in preparation, but no publication date has yet been set. The student interested in current naval management will want to give special attention to the next best source of information, the *Organization Manual of the Department of the Navy*, prepared by the Office of the Management Engineer, Department of the Navy (4th ed., 1951, NAVEXOS P-861), and to *The United States Navy*, an 86-page "Description of Its Functional Organization," also prepared by the Office of the Management Engineer (1952, NAVEXOS P-435). Study of these documents should precede any study of the single loose-leaf volume of *United States Navy Regulations* (G.P.O., Washington, 1948 to date) which outline the basic organization of the Navy in directives from the Office of the Secretary. Published for the Marine Corps—in accord with the above naval regulations and serving a somewhat more detailed purpose—is the three-volume, loose-leaf *Marine Corps Manual* (Headquarters, U. S. Marine Corps, Washington, 1949 to date). The 84-page manual, *The Navy at Sea and Ashore* (Department of the Navy, Washington, 1947, NAVEXOS P-472), is useful for an informal account of the organization and functions of the Navy and also contains some historical notes on the Navy's development. This should be supplemented by *The Navy: A Study in Administration*, a symposium reprinted from the Autumn, 1954 issue (Vol. 5) of the *Public Administration Review* by the Public Administration Service (Chicago, 1946), and by the 175-page study, *The Naval Establishment: Its Growth and Necessity for Expansion, 1930–1950* (Office of the Comptroller of the Navy, Department of the Navy, Washington, 1951, NAVEXOS P-1038).

Department of Defense. Information concerning the overall managerial problems of the Department of Defense is best obtained from the series of special studies commencing with those resulting in its creation and continuing with those which have from time to time resulted either in new legislation or in reorganizations of one sort or another. The Hoover Commission reports have been mentioned earlier and these are probably as good as any materials for a beginning. The most recent study of the Department as a whole, known as the "Rockefeller Report," is available as a committee print of the Senate Committee on Armed Services (83d Cong., 1st sess., April 11, 1953). It was in part on the basis of this report that the President submitted his proposals to Congress for reorganizing the Department in April, 1953.

At the same time, the President reported that the Secretary of Defense was initiating studies of the internal organization of the three major services. The Army was the first to publish the major findings of its study, known as the "Davies Report," a summary of which, under the title of "A Business Look at the Army," has been published in the July–August, 1954 issue (Vol. 32) of the *Harvard Business Review* and reprinted in the December, 1954 issue (Vol. 34) of the *Military Review.* The Navy followed with its *Report of the Committee on Organization of the Department of the Navy* (G.P.O., Washington, 1954), which is extremely useful for its summary of laws and regulations and its list of prior management studies and staff papers reviewed by the Committee. The author presumes that the Air Force report will soon be forthcoming. There have also been a number of overall studies of the organization of the Reserve components of the defense establishment, a general introduction to which can be obtained from the Spring, 1953 issue (Vol. 17) of *Military Affairs*, the entire issue being devoted to the topic, "The Reserves of the Armed Forces: A Historical Symposium."

VI. FOREIGN DOCUMENTS AND MATERIALS

A number of foreign countries, particularly Canada, Australia, India, New Zealand, and South Africa, have developed military history programs similar to ours. For a brief review of the activities in most of these programs—as well as of our own—see Gordon Harrison's article in the July 18, 1953 issue (Vol. 36) of the *Saturday Review of Literature.*

The principal journal devoted to the study of all aspects of World War II is the *Revue d'Histoire de la Deuxième Guerre Mondiale*, started in November of 1950 and published approximately three times a year under the editorship of Henri Michel, representing the Comité d'Histoire de la Guerre, Société d'Histoire de la Guerre, of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. The coverage of this review is world-wide, although French developments are emphasized and the articles are in French. Of special importance is the annotated bibliographical supplement which appears at least yearly. This bibliography is the only one regularly printed with world-wide coverage of military matters. It covers not only books and pamphlets but also many periodicals; and its reviews and annotations are most helpful.

Also of note is the extensive annotated bibliography covering both books and periodicals prepared by the Historical Office of the Army General Staff of the Italian Ministry of Defense. This is titled *Saggio Bibliografico sulla Seconda Guerra Mondiale* (Ufficio Storico, Stato Maggiore Esercito, Ministero della Difesa, Roma, 1949), and consists—together with a 1951 *Supplemento*—of 318 pages of relatively well indexed and annotated references relating to World War II, with the annotations in Italian. (In 1951 the author obtained this publication and the supplement for approximately $1.50 through the Libreria dello Stato, Piazza G. Verdi, 10-Roma, Italy.)

For more specific purposes, one may consult such further sources as the accessions lists of the British War Office Library, the British Imperial War Museum, and the German (Stuttgart) Bibliothek für Zeitgeschichte. The papers presented at the 1950 Conference on World War II History, held at Amsterdam under the auspices of the Netherlands Institute for War Documentation, are also useful and may be obtained from the New York Public Library in the form of microfilm positives. Supplementing these efforts are those of at least two American agencies. One, the USAF Historical Division, is developing a German monograph program in which former key figures in the German Air Force are preparing for the USAF some 40 monographs on the GAF in World War II. Under U. S. Army auspices, a *Guide to Foreign Military Studies, 1945–1954, Catalog and Index* (Headquarters, USAREUR) was published in 1954, listing the manuscripts produced under the Foreign Military Studies Program of the Historical Division, U. S. Army, Europe. Most of the manuscripts have been prepared by former high-ranking officers of the German armed forces under the sponsorship of the American Army.

Finally, there are the well-known British annual publications, *Brassey's Annual: The Armed Forces Year-Book* (Macmillan, New York, 1886-date); *Jane's All the World's Aircraft* (Sampson, Low, Marston, London, 1909–date); and *Jane's Fighting Ships* (Sampson, Low, Marston, London, 1898–date). The latter two publications are least useful for our purposes, but the analytical introductions to their technical information sections are frequently helpful on other matters. *Brassey's Annual* consists, however, of a most provocative collection of authoritative articles on a wide range of British, other foreign, and American military problems of relevance to all the services. This is a major source of information, and, unfortunately, there is no American equivalent.

VII. OTHER TYPES OF SOURCES

Military Service Publishing Company. Of special significance is this publishing house located at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, which issues such standard works as *The Articles of War Annotated, The Air Officer's Guide, The Army Officer's Guide, The Noncom's Guide, Essentials of Military Training,* and the particularly well-known *Company Administration and the Personnel Officer,* by Col. C. M. Virtue. One may write directly to the company for listings of current volumes, of which the above are only a few.

Newspapers. Frequently illuminating are many of the more or less regular newspaper articles on military affairs by such well-known writers as Walter Millis (N. Y. *Herald Tribune*), S. L. A. Marshall (Detroit *News*), Hanson W. Baldwin (N. Y. *Times*), and Mark S. Watson (Baltimore *Sun*). Current happenings in the military world are likely to receive their first critical appraisals in the columns of these journalist-historians.

Fiction. Finally, there is the increasing amount of fictional material relating to military operations of all sorts. Reference to a considerable number of volumes can be obtained from the last two editions of the Air Force Pamphlet 36-5-1, cited earlier, and occasionally from the "Military Library" section of *Military Affairs.* Fictional materials can frequently be used to considerable advantage, for they often convey the feel and sense of motion of military events as few nonfiction works can do; some of them, such as C. S. Forester's *The General* (reprinted by Bantam Books, New York, 1953), have been of influence in military circles.

VIII. CONCLUSION

While this survey has tended to emphasize the difficulties of research into military management, there is, nevertheless, wide opportunity, provided the prospective researcher knows what he wants and is willing to spend the time and energy necessary to obtain it. Though a few of them have been referred to above, the gaps in our knowledge and understanding of military management are too numerous to catalog here. However, for one useful listing of possible research topics—which could be duplicated many times over for all the military agencies—see the 21-page outline of *Suggested Fields for Theses of Military Students in the Social Sciences and Business Administration,* prepared in 1952 by the Office of the Chief of Military History, Department of the Army.

PAUL P. VAN RIPER.

Cornell University.

BOOK REVIEWS

Power through Purpose: The Realism of Idealism as a Basis for Foreign Policy. By Thomas I. Cook and Malcolm Moos. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1954. Pp. 216. $4.00.)

The Limits of Foreign Policy. By Charles Burton Marshall. (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1954. Pp. 128. $3.00.)

Civilization and Foreign Policy: An Inquiry for Americans. By Louis J. Halle. (New York: Harper and Bros. 1955. Pp. xxviii, 277. $3.75.)

Power and Policy: U. S. Foreign Policy and Military Power in the Hydrogen Age. By Thomas K. Finletter. (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co. 1954. Pp. viii, 408. $5.00.)

Realities of American Foreign Policy. By George F. Kennan. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1954. Pp. 120. $2.75.)

These five volumes deal broadly with basic general problems of American foreign policy. C. B. Marshall is explicitly concerned with limitations on that policy; Thomas K. Finletter writes mainly about armament and partly about disarmament; the remaining three attempt a more general view. Four of the books are by men who have recently held responsible offices in Washington; one is by two political scientists from Johns Hopkins. All of them have qualities, and one is first rate.

Power through Purpose is a product of the curious debate which has been proceeding within academic walls in recent years between Professor Hans J. Morgenthau and all comers. While much of this debate arose from misunderstanding, and some of it from annoyed response to annoying overstatement, it has in the end produced a good deal of careful thinking and sensible writing. This book is an example.

The first half of the book deals with views which the authors find insufficient; it is effective. In series Professors Cook and Moos dispose of isolationism, individualism, legalism, nationalistic self-interest, and power politics as unsound bases for American foreign policy. Within the limits of a necessary brevity (and this part of the book seems too long as it is), they deal carefully and reasonably with those whose arguments they reject. The rejection is not always based as squarely on fundamental theoretical points as the authors tend to assume; in some measure their rebuttals are merely tactical and might be weakened on a varying estimate of present facts. (Is it quite clear, for example, that balance-of-power politics has no present relevance?) Nevertheless, in the main the targets are squarely hit, and the authors earn their right to propose a different view. This is an achievement; probably the conclusions reached are shared by most serious students, but to get to them responsibly, persuasively, and fairly is not easy. None of the other volumes here considered, with the exception of George Kennan's, deals so well and reasonably with the positions it opposes.

The second half of the book is less convincing, though there is much good in it. The assessment of the basic American purpose in foreign affairs is strong, and there are some fresh and incisive comments on the consequences of this view for foreign economic policy; it is good to see the important work of Charles Beard in this area made relevant by an imaginative translation to present necessities. But I cannot avoid the feeling that the authors have stiffened their theoretical framework beyond necessity and even beyond reality, so that they are led to urge policies which would not advance the very purposes they set as basic. I do not think that insistence on "our way of social life" implies the desirability of trying to force the Russians to reform or leave the United Nations, because I believe that the consequence of such an effort would be to isolate us in large measure from those with whom we are trying to make common cause. Perhaps other non-Communist nations ought to see the matter as Professors Cook and Moos see it, but it is a stubborn fact that they do not, and policy must be framed accordingly. Similarly I must doubt that "the freedom of every people from an alien and imposed domination is a condition of that collective security which is our own interest and ideal." Every people is too many, and it is really wrong to suggest that our commitment to all who fall under tyranny "must be a restatement of General MacArthur's celebrated 'I shall return.' " MacArthur's was a pledge in declared and general war; short of general war such pledges can only too easily become words without deeds, and we have Professors Cook and Moos themselves, in an earlier chapter, to remind us that this is not the formula for effective policy. Though the last paragraph of the book has a strange phrase about the need to "make war *à outrance*," I find it hard to believe, from the rest of the argument, that the authors are really thinking of general war as a current instrument of national policy.

One antidote to the somewhat didactic and imperious tone of the latter part of *Power Through Purpose* is *The Limits of Foreign Policy*. Mr. Marshall's style is racy and amusing, and his book is full of stories, many of which are neatly appropriate to his argument. His central point is simple and well-taken: you cannot have what you want in foreign affairs by wishing for it, and too many Americans have thought and still think that you can. Mr. Marshall deals trenchantly with people who think this way, and he has a sharp eye for many of their characteristic errors: we forget that other nations are not boxcars to be shunted around by an American locomotive; we forget that legislation, in and of itself, gives no certainty of achievement; we forget that victory is not peace in our time but only a prevention of defeat; most of all we tend to forget that the only certainty in human affairs is uncertainty, and that plans and policies must be contingent and flexible. While these errors are now widely recognized, there remains in most of us a tendency to become firm about our preferences and certain of our convictions, and most convictions involve a substantial expectation of results. It is well to be reminded in such good humor of the point which Mr. Kennan sums up in a phrase: "We must be gardeners and not mechanics in our approach to world affairs."

But Mr. Marshall overstates his case. In part, of course, this is the natural result of his deliberate emphasis upon limits—he has not tried to state the range of real options, or to discuss in detail the possibilities and necessities of modern American policy, though there are brief passages, on both purpose and action, which make it clear that he is no defeatist and no advocate of passive surrender to the unpredictable. Nevertheless, the flavor of this volume is negative, and too certainly negative. In some degree it is an example of another form of easy error, the error which supposes that a sound general answer to problems of foreign policy is that there are no sound general answers. The proposition is self-contradictory, and Mr. Marshall seems unaware of the implications of this self-contradiction. By a sound instinct, he seeks illustration and enlightenment from history, but his view of history is uneven. The Kellogg-Briand Pact was not much help, but neither is it helpful to exaggerate the expectations of those who brought it about; and the follies of our neutrality legislation must be understood before they are denounced, lest we forget that there too politics was a matter of choice and uncertainty; many a statesman of that period could read Mr. Marshall a sermon on the limits of foreign policy. No doubt he could reply that he is not so much attacking statesmen as the forces that controlled them, but the answer too suggests a question for the present. While it is important to know how much we are limited, may it not be dangerous to suppose that the limits are fixed and given? It would be foolish to suppose that Mr. Marshall thinks any such thing; he has a wide experience of major efforts to expand the scope of policy and enlarge our field of action. But his book does not do him justice; like much of what has been said and written by those who left Washington in 1953, it reflects too much the general weariness with folly which is a natural result of service in responsible office, and too little the sense of purpose and leadership that marked the service itself.

Like Mr. Marshall, Louis Halle served as a member of the Policy Planning Staff of the State Department in the able team assembled by Paul Nitze under Mr. Acheson. Though their books are very different, the common influence on them is evident. Indeed, one value of these volumes is that they help to illuminate the pattern of thought of an important group in an important period. Mr. Halle's *Civilization and Foreign Policy* has another value for the student: the introduction by Dean Acheson has a most interesting statement of his view of the way a Secretary should work with his Department; if some of what is said may have been intended less as a commentary on his own stewardship than on what has happened since, that does not lessen its meaning.

Aware as he is of limits and follies, Mr. Halle has given his central effort to an enterprise that Mr. Marshall, judging by his book, would find of doubtful value. He seeks to develop for foreign affairs "an applicable body of theory," for which he felt a deep need "as a practical man dealing with practical problems." Sharing the general dissatisfaction with the governing ideas of the '20's and '30's, he starts from experience and history toward the same goal as Professors Cook and Moos. Some of their conclusions he shares: a nation's purposes in foreign policy are defined by its purposes as a society, and the two cannot be separated; in our case the purpose of a free society implies a coalition with those of similar intent both in opposition to the Soviet Union and in meeting our own problems. The conclusions are not startling, but they are well reached in both cases, and it is interesting that they can be reached in such different ways.

The weakness of Mr. Halle's way is not so much in his thought as in his exposition. He takes much too long about it. Some of his detours, like the examination of sea power and land power, are thin in themselves and largely irrelevant to his main argument, while whole chapters on such familiar subjects as the nature of the Soviet threat and the impossibility of isolation could well have been reduced to single paragraphs. In his preface Mr. Halle tells us that the book is a product of a private inquiry, and that its chapters "almost wrote themselves." A book presented to the public may well have this origin and this first draft, but it is not finished without much more.

Yet *Civilization and Foreign Policy* reveals a sensitive and perceptive intelligence. Mr. Halle's analysis of the interlocking connection between force, consent, and legitimacy is of real interest and importance, and the passages connecting his theory to such important questions as our policy toward China are generally persuasive. Less clear and careful, perhaps, than Professors Cook and Moos in the derivation of his general principles, he is more skillful and less dogmatic in their application.

Thomas K. Finletter is one of the small group of able and disinterested men who came to government during the second war and have continued since, more on than off, to carry major administrative responsibilities. Mr. Finletter's most recent service was as President Truman's Secretary of the Air Force. In that high office he was responsibly concerned with such great questions as the level of the various parts of our armed strength, and the basic way of making this and other big decisions. Mr. Finletter has proved in many writings that he has an unusual gift for lucid and persuasive analysis. In these circumstances the student would expect to find in his *Power and Policy* a major contribution to an extraordinarily difficult and important subject—a subject, moreover, on which good writing is rare. It is therefore no pleasure to have to report that his book is deeply disappointing.

Much of the trouble is not of Mr. Finletter's making. His central and controlling concern is to argue that we must have what he calls overwhelming air-atomic superiority and that we are not getting it. This is an argument which turns on quantities and qualities, many of which are necessarily secret; moreover, even what is unclassified or has been accidentally revealed must often be treated with reserve by a man whose work has made him so well-informed that his own statements or estimates are bound to be of interest to Soviet analysts. Thus there is good reason for Mr. Finletter to write with a careful eye on what he may or may not discuss, and in some measure it is right that we should be asked to take his conclusions on faith.

What is disappointing in Mr. Finletter's book is, first, that he does not seem at all conscious of the fact that such an act of faith is necessary for most of what he says, and second, that he relies on assertion rather than argument far beyond the limits set by a need for discretion. What does it mean to speak of "overwhelming" power "overwhelmingly" defended? Mr. Finletter makes this word carry much of his argument, and yet he has able passages on the impossibility of any very high level of defense. He asserts that what is necessary is a clear capacity to absorb a heavy blow and then "destroy the Russian state." What this phrase means he does not say, or even try to say. On Soviet intentions Mr. Finletter is sometimes pretty flat, but the arguments to support his certainty are thin—his account of Russian air development can be read against his thesis as well as for it. The cumulative effect is that of a certainty which relies on repetition and overstatement more than on reason and respect for opposing views. This would not matter much if Mr. Finletter's thesis were trivial and his competence doubtful. Since his argument is important and his claim to a view unquestionable—since, indeed, he may well be terribly right—the weakness of the analysis is distressing. And unfortunately these same comments apply to Mr. Finletter's later discussion of the need for disarmament.

Power and Policy is nevertheless a book which students of our military policy and the way of its making must find of great interest. Its best passages are those which deal with the process of decision on the level of armed strength. Here Mr. Finletter is his more usual clear and persuasive self; there may be ground for some doubt that his answers are the only ones available—in particular I am not sure that the overall budgetary ceiling is as hard to change as he implies—but the basic analysis is illuminating, not only in itself, but for what it shows of the way a notable Secretary has faced his difficulties.

The shortest and best of the books at hand is *Realities of American Foreign Policy*, George Kennan's Stafford Little Lectures of 1954. Mr. Kennan has a great initial advantage in his mastery of the English language—the subtle precision and felicity of his prose are a welcome change from the pseudo-simple Pentagonese that has invaded Mr. Finletter's writing. Probably also he has an advantage in the limits of space imposed by the Stafford Little platform; he has no room for the repetitions and simple long-windedness that mar most of these other books. Mr. Kennan has the further advantage that he is at once a professional diplomat and a serious student, and has been both for a long time.

The book which results is one which other students must read with admiration. If on one point or another there is some disagreement (as there is for me with part of Mr. Kennan's indictment of our early twentieth-century policy), there is the great compensation that the cool and generous style leaves room for difference and even accommodation; the main line of the argument is not overthrown by occasional divergence, and the discussion leaves the reader sympathetic even where he differs. Mr. Kennan is modestly and steadily concerned with illumination, not with debating. The book does deal with much-debated questions, for Mr. Kennan has accidentally become a symbol of the so-called policy of containment, but his superb discussion of this problem has the proper purpose of showing that in reality "containment and liberation are only two sides of the same coin." Repeatedly he deals with large and hard questions which have well-known shorthand forms: traditional diplomacy versus the United Nations, law versus change, moral purpose versus reality, generosity versus firmness in dealing with our allies. Each time he has a definite view, but always this view has a depth and comprehension that make the simple opposition show its lack of real meaning.

The most startling passages in *Realities of American Foreign Policy* deal not with what we have historically recognized as foreign questions, but with our behavior on such great issues as immigration, tariff policy, cultural concern, conservation, urban redevelopment, and simple self-respecting liberty. Mr. Kennan argues that for reasons of policy as well as national purpose wide changes in our behavior on these matters are badly needed. In his short and sweeping statement of this view he does seem to give little attention to the size of the demand he is making, not so much on our people as on our political processes and presuppositions. In every one of these great problems the *status quo* is surrounded by heavily armed batteries of defenders. In a sense, then, Mr. Kennan here offers not a program of what is practicable, but a standard of what is inescapably necessary. But while it might be useful to expose his program to some warning on the limits of domestic policy, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that he has eloquently stated some major tasks that can be let slide only at grave peril. He is certainly right that as a nation we can attack these tasks whenever, as a nation, we will. Since I share his view that in these fields the right course is plain and plainly urgent, I believe that a call to action is fair.

When all carping is done, these books, with others, mark a forward step in our study of foreign affairs. The academic men are perhaps still too certain about practical issues, and the men who have held responsible offices are sometimes too sure that there is no other road to wisdom—Mr. Marshall has a particularly blunt sentence to this effect. But both sides are coming to a recognition that the real issues have a depth and range which was not covered by traditional American work in international relations, whether by diplomats or professors. It is also encouraging that both sides, as they wrestle with the problem, appeal often to history. Mr. Halle is certainly right in asserting the high present relevance of Thucydides.

At the same time we must understand also how much remains to be done. There is much appeal to history in these volumes, but it is often not very good history. At least two of these books seem confused about our entry into World War I; two are at direct odds over the meaning of the League of Nations, and both seem incorrect to me. History is the right teacher, I believe, but her lessons are not at the surface. Moreover, this *is* a new age for the United States, and it follows that recent history has a peculiar importance. So one must hope that these able men, with others, will be willing to go on from their general statements to an examination of the detailed issues and events with which they have had such close connection. We need to know more of the issues that Mr. Marshall found in practice to be so closely balanced; we could learn from Mr.

Halle's view of Chilean copper. Mr. Finletter has much more to tell us about decision making, and Mr. Kennan is one of the very few men in the country who might spread on a large historical canvas the kind of wisdom he has here so clearly sketched.

As such studies continue, we who are in the universities may be able to continue the kind of work of clarification and discrimination that Professors Cook and Moos have done; we might also contribute to the writing of relevant history. And perhaps as the work goes on, we shall all get past the need to deal at length with the relatively obvious—for there is much in each of these books that overlaps at length with one or more of the others. Then, indeed, the study of our foreign affairs might begin to come of age.

McGeorge Bundy.

Harvard University.

A Report on the Behavioral Sciences at the University of Chicago. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1954. Pp. 180. $2.50. Supplementary Documents, pp. 144. Mimeographed.)

The Behavioral Sciences at Harvard. Report by a Faculty Committee. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Pp. 518. 1954.)

Survey of the Behavioral Sciences. Report of the Faculty Committee and Report of the Visiting Committee. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan. Pp. 237. 1954.)

The University of North Carolina Survey of Behavioral Science, 1953–1954. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina. Pp. 604. Mimeographed.)

The Stanford Survey of the Behavioral Sciences, 1953–1954. Report of the Executive Committee and Staff. (Stanford: Stanford University. 1955. Pp. 172; Appendices, pp. 163. Mimeographed.)

In March, 1953, the Behavioral Sciences Division of the Ford Foundation announced that it seemed "an appropriate time for a small group of American universities selected from among those providing leadership in this field to take a systematic look at the state of the behavioral sciences at their institutions and to express their needs in terms of detailed plans for development and improvement." Fifteen places with active graduate work were invited to submit plans of self-survey; five were chosen on the basis of the quality of these plans and such factors as geographical distribution. An award of $50,000 was made to each, about two-thirds being for the support of a committee of the university's own faculty and administrative staff including released time for its members. The remainder was to facilitate the work of a visiting committee selected jointly by the institution and the Foundation, which was to assist the home committee and review its conclusions.

The survey was to take about a year. Typically it involved considerable questioning of faculty members. At Harvard, for example, every fourth member in half a dozen departments was chosen by lot for a lengthy confidential interview and comments were obtained from nearly ninety percent of the graduate students in these departments. As for the visiting committees, the Foundation suggested that they should "typically include leaders in the behavioral sciences from other universities, scholars from other disciplines, and laymen with a background in the scientific study of man and in its application to human affairs." The visiting committee for Michigan, headed by V. O. Key, met at Ann Arbor four times for spells of several days. From such efforts came the five lengthy volumes of self-survey and the brief final reports of the visiting committees. In addition an unpublished memorandum of overall comment was prepared by the Foundation representative, W. Allen Wallis, who accompanied the visiting groups.

The Foundation's prospectus said that the recommendations of the home and visiting committees should be "workable planning documents for the improvement of the scientific study of human behavior at the institution for a period of about five years." It suggested that attention should be given to such matters as the following: basic objectives for the behavioral sciences at the university; relations among its parts; the quality and number of students and their preparation; areas of special university competence, with an eye to division of labor among universities; the nature of the research program; the curriculum, including alternative graduate programs and relationships between professional and research training; strengths and needs of personnel; the character of "the intellectual atmosphere for the development of scientists and scholars"; and "the application of behavioral knowledge and contributions of the behavioral sciences to public life."

Inquiries so designedly self-centered naturally resulted in much detail of mainly local bearing, although suggestive even as detail to curriculum-builders and directors of graduate work and research everywhere. Harvard's home committee remarks that its most important audience is the Harvard community, although it hopes to find "a second audience in the academic profession outside Harvard, especially in the behavioral sciences." The visiting committee considered this report almost a model piece of work: "thoughtful, comprehensive, and, above all, factual." The Chicago home committee says frankly that "in writing this report we address ourselves to our own university community." It notes that the study has already "set in motion discussion and considerable self-examination of groups within the university; it has brought together faculty with common interests; and parts of our recommended program are already launched." Here the visiting committee regretted the generality of some key aspects of the report. At Michigan, however, the visiting committee was "struck by the number and scale of the proposals for expansion." Breadth of survey, it thought, had been sacrificed to "interest in locating and defining specific behavioral science projects, old and new, worthy of support." Nor did it believe that the home committee had sufficiently followed the Foundation's request to consider the division of labor among universities generally. The same regret was voiced by the visiting committee about the Harvard report. As a matter of fact, that report does mention the unwisdom of duplicating the impressive equipment, experience, and service of the Michigan Institute for Social Research which in 1948 brought together the Survey Research Center (taken over two years before from the Department of Agriculture's division of program surveys) and the Research Center for Group Dynamics, projecting Kurt Lewin's impetus. If the visiting committee at Michigan found that the report shows "a certain narrowness in the conception of 'behavioral science,'" the visitors recognized that it properly reflects the distinctively empirical stress of behavioral science at Michigan, "distinguished for the energy and ingenuity with which it has developed methods and facilities for such observation and analysis."

It is fair to add that the Michigan report does canvass the questions to be resolved in seeking an optimal balance; its list might well be a prospectus of the issues that underlie the subject of these volumes: interest in formal theory versus empirical data; fundamental versus applied research; concern for method versus the substantive aspects of problems; a conceptual basis in a single discipline versus a basis in more than one; individual versus collaborative research; concentration of activity in a research organization versus its distribution among departments; free funds versus restricted contracts or grants; the demands of research versus those of teaching.

The point of general significance in all this is what is betokened by the vogue of the term "behavioral sciences." The Ford Foundation notably helped to give it currency by applying the name Behavioral Sciences Division to what had been called its program of individual behavior and social relations. The announcement of the plan of university self-surveys said: "The term 'behavioral sciences' refers to all those intellectual activities which contribute to the scientific study of human behavior." It neither includes nor excludes academic disciplines as such. "In this program," the invitation declared, "the Foundation is concerned with the university's total resources for the scientific study of man's behavior." Thus the scope turns on the meaning of two words: behavior and scientific.

The participating universities give somewhat different answers to the always puzzling question of what to include. The Harvard report takes the term broadly and rather simply, almost as another way of saying social science, interpreting it to cover anthropology, economics, government, history, psychology, and sociology, with their applications in business, education, law, medicine, public health, and elsewhere. Even more simply, Stanford identifies certain departments and institutes as the core units of study. The Harvard group notes in passing that a case could be made for including much of biology and, on the other side, "philosophy or scholarship in various fields of literature." The humanities-natural sciences axis is seen as a continuum; departments and, even more, individuals are variously distributed along this axis. The North Carolina report observes that the term "behavioral sciences" has only recently come into general use and that none of the proffered definitions is successful. "Broadly speaking," it suggests, the term "refers to the activities and knowledge more commonly known as social science, except that the more philosophical and legal aspects of social science are excluded, and certain portions of biological science are included." More revealing than this general comment are the remarks in the section on "political behavior"—of which I shall speak later—where the words are understood to indicate an approach, not a field. At Michigan the survey committee stated that the term "behavioral sciences" is "of recent coinage, and its meaning is neither precise nor stable." Generally they prefer to be guided by "the most explicit and authoritative definition," that of the Ford Foundation's division in its 1953 annual report. Their survey concentrated on the departments of anthropology, economics, political science, psychology, and sociology, the social psychology program, and the Institute for Social Research.

The Chicago report, seeking the concept behind the label for something "still in process of creation and definition," points to a clue in the words "objective description of regularities." It recalls that the Foundation's prospectus said: "the central focus consists of a dominating interest in the nature of humanity as that nature may be understood through objective description of regularities." At Chicago the disciplines of psychology, anthropology, and sociology are assumed to be close to the focus. Off at one corner, in a domain without precise limits, stands biology; at another the physical sciences and mathematics; at another the humanities. In this spirit the Chicago report underscores the canon of predictability. "We must all recognize," it says, "that all behavioral science studies must result in propositions that lend themselves to that confirmation which is the goal of all science." It argues further: "An idea is good not simply because it is exciting, not just because it is about some socially important problem with consequences for action; to be good an idea must also be true in the sense that it generates non-contradictory predictions that are confirmed and it is important that it generates many such predictions."

It is peculiarly of interest here as well as emblematic to consider the meaning given to "political behavior." The Harvard committee, admitting much disagreement about what is indicated, finds one connotation clear and generally accepted. "It is a methodological connotation and makes 'behavioral' studies those involving direct, empirical observation of how people behave in particular situations." The North Carolina report, outstandingly enthusiastic about the concept, paraphrases and reinforces the statement of the 1951 summer conference sponsored by the Social Science Research Council. "As a focal area," it says, "the study of political behavior is not set apart from other aspects of the study of government or of politics by virtue of a unique body of subject matter." Rather it is "one 'approach' or 'way' to study most of the customary subject matter of political science." It extends to "the whole range of behavior patterns which reflect power and influence in the relationships of men to men and, therefore, lie at the heart of the process of governing." Elsewhere the report remarks that "behavior is commonly understood to refer to the goal-seeking activities of human actors." The stress falls heavily upon methods suited to "discover uniformities in the actual behavior of men and groups in the process of governing" and to show the extent of their prevalence. Two things are necessary to develop generalizations and in time to formulate a theory about human behavior: major reliance on empirical methods and rigorously systematic research. Therefore hypotheses to be tested must be stated explicitly and they must be tested "through the careful ordering of empirical evidence in a fashion that can be validated by successive research efforts." This emphasis, it is said, "means a departure from the normative character of much research in political science." But the evangel of citizenship is not disavowed in the North Carolina report. A reason for the growing urgency of understanding more about political behavior is to develop "politics adequate to cope with the problems of modern government" at all levels. Among other advantages, "the political scientist can now teach 'real life' party politics, replacing myths with analysis of observed behavior in the political process," helping future party leaders, public officers, and citizens alike. The capstone of the appeal is completed by adding another phrase of the day: such studies, it is said, afford one way by which political scientists can serve the cause "of working for a more rational process of public decision-making." With all respect both for the truth and for the political scientists who seek this sort of truth fall the bitter chips where they may, I suggest that the net result may be the opposite.

Except at North Carolina, political science departments do not appear in these five university self-surveys as prime factors in the development of what is called behavioral science. Harvard's department of government, drawing more undergraduate majors than any other in Harvard College, shares a general university tradition in its "emphasis upon theory and perhaps history," with "hospitality to normative points of view." The survey, however, not only mentions V. O. Key's push toward field work but also takes account of Pendleton Herring's pioneering in the preparation of cases in public administration. On the graduate level, 15 percent of the Ph.D. degrees given at Harvard in 1952–53 in the behavioral sciences were in government, 30 percent in economics, and 31 percent in history, but only 12 percent in psychology, whereas in the country as a whole the corresponding percentages in 1952 were 11, 17, 22, and 37—the last figure reflecting a significant as well as spectacular increase that is not without traces of danger when considered in relation to the manipulative itches of our times.

The exponents of the behavioral approach are sensitive to the charge that they are preoccupied with method. The Harvard survey observes that "the uneasy middle position of the work in the behavioral sciences, lying somewhere between the humanities and the natural sciences, leads to a heavy preoccupation with methodology." A more appreciative view is the declaration of the North Carolina committee that "behavioral science training cannot at the present time neglect paying the broadest kind of attention to methodology," since "scientific knowledge basically rests on observation and description, and on the conceptualization of phenomena." Chicago argues on the basis of local experience that "a strong and rather uniformly distributed interest *in* method" there is not found inconsistent with "diversity *of* method." But the plural harmony indicated in this comment is qualified by the visiting committee's finding (in its appraisal of the self-survey at Chicago) that, whatever its limitations, the survey had at least enforced attention to "the existence of challenging unresolved issues among the exponents of various approaches to learning in the university faculty (notably between those whose focus is primarily on ideas and those who center their hopes in the exploitation of quantifiable empirical data.)"

The question of method is partly one of individual or team work. The enthusiasts for behavioral science as an approach accept and extol the degree to which it is collaborative. The disciplines differ in degree as do the individuals within them. At Harvard it is noted that "most of the historians and political scientists are lone wolves in their research. Most of the anthropologists, psychologists, and sociologists do at least part of their research in team projects. The economists are more divided."

The methods of behavioral science are costly. At Michigan only ten percent of the projects in the inventory are conducted without any special financial assistance. Yet all the surveys testify to the risks, if not existing dangers, involved in the heavy and relatively increasing dependence on restricted funds. At Chicago (where the ratio of such dependence has increased nearly five-fold in less than a decade and a half) the home committee soundly declares: "The development of a genuinely distinguished faculty—through commitments to people of positions on the academic ladder and of tenure—is realistically possible only from general funds of the university."

It is the possibility of distortion and disproportion, however unlikely such an outcome, that gives pause in praising the ferment reflected in the volumes under review. The hill must be climbed by many paths and, central though man is, there is more than one hill to climb. Looking hard at things is not the end or even the beginning of wisdom but to look hard is supremely important; it is as important for the artist, say, as for the natural scientist. One looks in various ways, however. One way is historical, the traditional and prevalent method of many social disciplines. Those who use it may well say that even the natural sciences—and not solely those that deal with organic life—push this method of direct observation as far as microscopes and telescopes will carry; whenever they can they watch things happen and build analysis on narration. It is because the ultimate details cannot be seen that inferences must be drawn from apparent repetition.

So far as regularity and uniformities are concerned, must there not be a fundamental difference of direction between the drives of the physical and social sciences? The first brushes past apparent diversities and, as its main thrust, probes for the suspected underlying simplicities of the physical universe. Such, for the present at least, is its fitting as well as understandable *élan*. But the studies of man's behavior, individually and in association, in description as well as prescription, must, I think, ever face toward diversity. From this standpoint I confess I wince at some of the phrases I have quoted as goals of behavioral science, although I am aware of the presumed wider context in which they are uttered.

One notes in these surveys an insufficient though not wholly absent attempt to differentiate types of inquiry concerned with "the objective description of regularities," on the one hand, and, on the other, studies that emphasize policy, whether in "cases" or otherwise. For in the latter types of studies the double essence is the variety of combinations and the value judgments that enter into policy choices. Many different influences are indeed enriching the field of attention called political science. With boundaries going down, its peculiar center, I believe, must continue to be the intersection of lines that represent structure, process, policy. Maintaining contact with this center, it can move out along any line. The line of structure is the structure of the state; the line of process includes how men think, associate, decide.

How could political science face its distinctive task without being normative? Its especial concern is the motives and major apparatus of conscious adjustment. Here it is not enough for theory to shape itself as an explanation of facts; it must seek to lead them. This too is behavior.

Space has not permitted me, amid the many injustices of these fragmentary comments on voluminous reports that cover the varied work of many hundreds of creative scholars, to do justice to much suggestive material on the recruiting and training of students within and across disciplines. Graduate students, as the Chicago report observes, "must see the faculty at work in order to know what the discipline really is." In this sense more of the atmosphere of apprenticeship without exploitation is desirable. The crucial need is the initial recruiting of promising personnel. At the undergraduate level it is not important, nor even preferable, that the student major in the field of his later concentration. It is imperative that he have the galvanizing experience of observing human beings directly under conditions that give a glimpse of how a measure of system can be brought to bear in watching and reporting the richness of their responses.

ARTHUR W. MACMAHON.

Columbia University.

Freedom and Control in Modern Society. EDITED BY MORROE BERGER, THEODORE ABEL, AND CHARLES H. PAGE. (New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc. 1954. Pp. xii, 326. $4.50.)

To honor Robert M. MacIver, some 15 of his former students and colleagues combined to produce this excellent volume. The contributors include a galaxy of distinguished scholars from a dozen different institutions and many social science disciplines. Fourteen essays are devoted in one way or another to two major problems on which Professor MacIver himself had written, one being "Social Control, the Group and the Individual," and the second "The State and Society." The first group includes "The Internalization of Social Controls," by Gardner Murphy; "Friendship as Social Process: A Substantive and Methodological Analysis," by Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Robert K. Merton; "The Problem of Authority," by Robert Bierstedt; "The Political Process in Trade Unions: A Theoretical Statement," by Seymour Martin Lipset; "Social Groups in the Modern World," by Florian Znaniecki; "Social Structure and Goals in Group Relations," by Milton M. Gordon; and "Ethnic Groups in America; From National Culture to Ideology," by Nathan Glazer.

Group two, on the state and society, includes essays on "Individual Liberty Today: Challenge and Prospect," by Thomas I. Cook; "America's Changing Capitalism: The Interplay of Politics and Economics," by J. M. Clark; "The Demographic Foundations of National Power," by Kingsley Davis; "Social Change in Soviet Russia," by Alex Inkeles; and "The Utility of Political Science," by George Catlin. The volume appropriately concludes with two further essays on "Robert M. MacIver's Contributions to Sociological Theory," by Harry Alpert, and "Robert M. MacIver's Contributions to Political Theory," by David Spitz.

The high quality of the entire volume makes it difficult to summarize in whole or in part. Social scientists of widely differing interests will find here new insights on some of the most difficult problems in the broad and complex fields of sociology and political science. Moreover, they will lay the volume down, as I have, with renewed admiration and respect for Robert MacIver's contribution to both of these fields. I particularly commend to my colleagues in political science Seymour Lipset's analysis of "The Political Process in Trade Unions," J. M. Clark's essay on "The Interplay of Politics and Economics," and Kingsley Davis' "The Demographic Foundations of National Power." Professor Lipset's brilliant theoretical statement offers the best single critique of Michel's iron law of oligarchy that I have seen. In his analysis of the "internal politics" of trade unions, he proposes a number of tentative propositions that have application far beyond the narrow framework to which they immediately relate. I select a few at random by way of illustration:

> It may be stated as a general hypothesis that the greater the number of independent sources of power and status in an organization, the greater the possibility that alternative factions or parties will be established to oppose the incumbent parties.
>
> The more a given group holds a democratic anti-elitist value system, the more difficult it should be to institutionalize oligarchy. . . .
>
> One would, therefore, expect to find among the unions in which the conditions for the maintenance of oligarchy are not stable, a greater proportion of the two extremes, democratic institutions and dictatorial mechanisms.
>
> The more narrowly an organization defines its functions, as fulfilling limited and specific needs, the less likely the member will feel the need to participate in and influence the policies of the organization.
>
> The ease with which an oligarchy can control a large organization will vary with the degree to which the members are involved in the organization.

In an appendix to Professor Lipset's chapter appears an analysis of some of the methodological problems involved in the study and evaluation of these and other propositions. I have singled out also J. M. Clark's essay on the "Interplay of Politics and Economics," mainly because of his renewed emphasis upon the integral relation of these two important fields of study—upon what used to be called "political economy." In doing so he offers something of a challenge to contemporary economic theory, which seems too often unrelated to the world of reality. For example: "Economists naturally want a theory of the forces determining wages. Their inherited theory—that of marginal productivity—is a theory of competitive equilibrium, and its relevance is obviously called in question by modern forms of collective bargaining." Professor Clark suggests that labor theory might gain in both realism and relevance if labor unions were regarded as primarily political entities.

Kingsley Davis offers in summary a test for greatness among nations that might well serve as a basis for a college course in power politics. "We have now covered," he writes, "from a demographic point of view, some of the traits of a powerful nation. Such a nation is one that has a large population, a rich and extensive territory, an industrial economy, a high proportion of its people in nonagricultural pursuits, a high degree of urbanization, a low agricultural density, a great amount of public education, and a balance of low fertility and low mortality. Few nations in the world have all of these attributes. Those that have them we call the Great Powers." Professor Davis would be the first to admit that this is not a novel idea, although unfortunately it is one too frequently forgotten in much contemporary writing and debate on foreign policy.

It would be impossible to do full justice in a brief review to the many ideas packed within the covers of this *festschrift*. Robert Bierstedt's analysis of the problems of authority should commend itself to readers who value logic, clarity, and modesty in social science literature. Nathan Glazer's study of ethnic groups in America is a refreshing, and in some respects novel, reappraisal of both "cultural pluralism" and the so-called "melting pot" theory of assimilation. Each chapter indeed has a unique contribution to make. It is a high tribute to Professor MacIver that the distinguished scholars represented in this volume should honor him not by gestures of deference but by exhibiting on a high plane the qualities that he himself so eminently embodied. I particularly liked Harry Alpert's evaluation of MacIver's contributions to sociological theory. Without attempting to summarize this essay, I cannot forebear to quote certain passages:

> MacIver came upon the American scene in the early 1920's. American sociology could then be characterized as a non-philosophical and even anti-philosophical creature content to wallow in the big heap of factual garbage which it has been busily piling up in its own raw, empirical trough. . . . Mr. MacIver fought valiantly amongst the excesses and wastes of the raw, empiricistic position.

In place of the "passive, mechanistic creature responding automatically to external stimuli which have no particular meaning to him," MacIver substitutes "the image of man as an idealistic, goal-seeking, value-creating being who is especially distinguished by his capacity to impose meanings to events, objects, and people;" and there is profound wisdom in his statement of what he called the paradox of knowledge: "The only things we know as immutable truths are the things we do not understand. The only things we understand are mutable and never fully known."

The world of social science scholarship is indebted to the publisher and to the editors of this rich and stimulating volume. It not only does honor to a great man, but offers food for thought and reflection to all who know that the proper study of mankind is man.

PETER H. ODEGARD.

University of California (Berkeley).

Medieval Political Ideas. BY EWART LEWIS. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1954. 2 vols. Pp. xii, 356; v., 661. $12.50.)

The teacher as well as the student of political theory has for a long time found it difficult to get at the sources of medieval political thought; there exist, certainly, some translations of such books as Aquinas' *De Regimine Principum* of which, by the way, only a third was written by Aquinas himself, or of Marsilio of Padua's *Defensor Pacis*, the darling of nineteenth-century anticlerical liberals. But on the whole, especially because of the decay of the knowledge of Latin, few are able to read the many editions in the original language which the revival of medieval studies has brought since the latter part of the last century. Though there are admirable works on medieval political ideas with numerous extracts from the sources, to mention only Otto von Gierke, the Carlyles and, more recently, C. H. McIlwain, Alois Dempf, Georges de Lagarde, Friedrich Heer, and Fr. A. von der Heydte, they too, with some exceptions, are not easily usable by students because of difficulties of language. It was, therefore, a long felt need—especially in view of the rising interest in medieval political thought and its pervading force in, and critical import for, modern political thought—to have available in English translations selected chapters from the writings of the more important writers of that period.

We owe, therefore, a great measure of thanks to Mrs. Ewart Lewis, a student of Professor C. H. McIlwain, the greatest authority on medieval political thought in this country, for having brought about, through years of hard, meticulous work, a collection of medieval sources in English translation with detailed introductions, which are ordered according to eight topics. The use of the topical instead of the historical-developmental method has certain advantages; the disadvantages are avoided by the introductions to the topics which include about one-third of the two volumes and give the historical development of the ideas. The sources are organized under such headings as the idea of law; property and lordship; the origin and purpose of political authority; the structure of authority in the Church (the dispute between the papalist position and the conciliar theory and its influence on political ideas are treated here); and the problems of the Empire. Numerous, well-selected and—as a check showed—ably-translated chapters not only by the better and known medieval writers, but also by authors as difficult to get at as James of Viterbo, Tholommeo of Lucca, Engelbert of Admont, and Alexander of Roes are gathered together.

In addition, quotations from the *Somnium Viridarii* and other anonymous but widely spread pamphlets are used. Since there are many important writers on politics in the Middle Ages, one has to make a choice and that, naturally, produces difficulties. Though Mrs. Lewis has shown good judgment, the reviewer regrets that no excerpts from the Roman Law and its great glossator, Bartolus di Sassoferrato, the most quoted medieval jurist, are included, especially when one considers the impact of the Roman Law upon medieval thought, clerical as well as lay. There is an alluring ambivalence of the Roman Law in medieval political thought: in the struggle between Pope and Emperor, the canonists as well as the jurists of the Emperor appealed to it, and in the fight of the rising sovereign states the legists used it against both Emperor and Pope, the representatives of medieval universalism.

Others might have liked to see something of the great Spaniard, Ramon Lull, or of John of Viterbo (A. Salvemini's edition, 1901 [*Bibliotheca juridica medii aevi*, Vol. 3], is available), or the beautiful paragraphs (e.g., III, 42.6) of Eike von Repkow's *Sachsenspiegel.* Yet there is such an embarrassment of riches that it is perhaps unfair to criticize the choice the author had to make. One theme this reviewer would have liked to see more elaborated is "Political Augustinianism"—to use the title of Arquillière's book. This is stressed, rightly, by von der Heydte (*Die Geburtsstunde des souveränen Staates*).

The rich variety of medieval political thought comes out convincingly in these two volumes. No monolithic structure either in mind or in society and no absolute control by ecclesiastic absolutist power, as all too many think, prevailed in the Middle Ages. Also shown is the power of ideas which are anything but unreal, merely reflected, superstructures. Thus the reception of Aristotle's *Politics* by Albertus Magnus and his greater pupil, Aquinas, became, though both might not have been aware of it, a revolutionary move; for it gave the temporal state a *raison d'être* of its own, an autonomous *telos,* and showed that political loyalty and the rights and duties of citizens were independent of Faith and Grace; that in other words even the state of pagans was a true state with which binding treaties by Christian states were morally and juridically possible; the first inkling of a truly *jus inter gentes.* Similarly, the new theory of the state as *societas perfecta* provided the jurists of the rising sovereign state with a philosophical argument against the older theory of the universal Empire, co-extensive with Christendom. Thus political thought in the Middle Ages had real significance in historical development, and these volumes have the great merit of letting the student become aware of an exciting era which in many ways is the cradle of modern political and juridical institutions.

If then a few minor points of criticism are made, this is not done to detract in any way from the praise these two volumes deserve. "Theft" in *extremis* as permissible is a much more common doctrine than is asserted (p. 98). The origin of political authority is undoubtedly based on consent (therefore the juridical figure of a social compact), but such is not always the case with tenure of political authority; here the legitimizing element is service to the common good (p. 158). In this connection, the social compact theory (p. 161) was probably more familiar to medieval thinking, according to Tirchleder and von der Heydte. It deserved mention (p. 203) that Nicolaus II, 1059–1061, introduced the rule of a two-thirds majority for the election of the Pope by the College of Cardinals. Erich Caspar's and Johannes Haller's works on the Papacy might profitably have been consulted (pp. 359–62). On page 377 one reads that "The process of Revelation still continued"; that is an impossible thought for medieval theology, though the heads of sects might claim such a continued revelation.

The value of these scholarly and highly usable volumes is enhanced by an extensive bibliography and a good index.

H. A. ROMMEN.

Georgetown University.

The Right of Counsel in American Courts. BY WILLIAM M. BEANEY. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 1955. Pp xi, 268. $4.50.)

The right of counsel in criminal prosecutions is an historic one specifically guaranteed by the Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution and inherent in the concept of fair trial. Moreover, state constitutions almost invariably contain provisions safeguarding the right. Long taken for granted, this procedural safeguard has recently become the source of much litigation and controversy. From this has come a flow of legal opinion and literature of which the book under review is the first single comprehensive treatment.

The study resulted "from an attempt to learn whether the right of counsel . . . is enjoyed as consistently and widely in the United States as the needs of justice require." To achieve this result the author examines the history of the right of counsel; how the right as guaranteed in the Sixth Amendment has been interpreted; how federal courts have construed the right under the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment; and practical implications of the right. As the discussion proceeds, it is evident that the author is master of his materials. The outcome is a scholarly treatise that American students of political and legal theory and practice will find invaluable.

This book, like the writings of Corwin, Pritchett, Cushman, Carr, Fellman, and others, further documents the turmoil that marks constitutional interpretation during the past two decades. So far as the Sixth Amendment is concerned, libertarians saw their views triumph in *Johnson* v. *Herbst*, 302 U.S. 458 (1938). The essence of the rule announced by this decision was that in *all* criminal proceedings before federal courts the accused has the right of counsel unless a competent waiver is made. The announcement of this, according to Dr. Beaney, "raised the right to counsel to a level not attained during the previous one hundred and forty-nine years."

Where state proceedings are concerned, the controversy has been as intense but the outcome for those accused of crimes less clear and generous. In several cases, beginning with *Powell* v. *Alabama*, 287 U.S. 45 (1932), the Supreme Court came close to "federalizing" the right of counsel, but in the end it shied away from this extreme. The Supreme Court has gone so far as to say, however, that the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment requires an offer of counsel in all capital cases. It has also said that states deny counsel at the risk of reversal for having omitted an important element of fair trial. While these admonitions have doubtless strengthened the procedural safeguards of persons accused of violating state laws, they fall short of the uniform federal-state rule urged by an impressive line of judicial dissents and by champions of civil liberties generally.

Dr. Beaney is properly critical of the confusion left by judicial vacillations and suggests that until the views of Justices Douglas and Black prevail sufficiently to incorporate the right of counsel in the Fourteenth Amendment, the states themselves should bring their standards up to those now required by the Sixth Amendment. He suggests that this be done where possible by judicial rule, otherwise by statute. Making this change, the author suggests, would be a far more constructive approach for the states than continuing to inveigh against federal interference in judicial proceedings.

After making his careful and thorough review of legal aspects of the problem, Dr. Beaney concludes that so far as the federal courts are concerned the counsel problem is "substantially solved." Among the states, however, the author finds the situation spotty and in need of improvement. In addition to suggesting that state legal requirements be brought in line with federal standards, the author recommends that states review their methods of appointing counsel for the indigent and make greater use of legal-aid societies and public defenders.

What limitations this study has are not in competence, industry, or skill, but in the method used to discover the answer to an important and complex problem. Had the approach been sociological, rather than legalistic, the reviewer ventures the opinion that the evidence would have shown that the right of counsel is enjoyed less "consistently and widely" in both federal and state jurisdictions than is indicated by this study.

JOHN H. FERGUSON.

The Pennsylvania State University.

The Prospects for Communist China. BY W. W. ROSTOW IN COLLABORATION WITH RICHARD W. HATCH, FRANK A. KIERMAN, JR., AND ALEXANDER ECKSTEIN, and with the Assistance of Others at The Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. (New York: The Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1954. Pp. xx, 379. $5.00.)

The aim of this book, as stated in its preface, is to draw together in a short volume what is known about Communist China and to assist in the making of a unified interpretation of Peking's intentions and ability to achieve them. Conceived as an interpretive essay rather than as a scholarly monograph, the book seeks to fathom the operative motivations of the Peking regime, its current intentions with respect to the society of the mainland and the external world, the problems it confronts, its likelihood of success or failure, and the prospects for change in Chinese Communist society over the foreseeable future.

This is a large undertaking in a field where close observation and verification are difficult or impossible to achieve. It is inevitable, therefore, that many of the questions posed by the volume must be met by surmise rather than documentation, but in terms of their stated rationale the authors have done well. The book will be of great value to policy makers and should be read by every person who seeks to keep himself informed on developments in Asia.

The book begins with a relatively short narrative and interpretation of major developments in modern Chinese history—the crumbling of the Manchu empire, the development of the Kuomintang, the rise of the Communist movement, and the eventual victory of Mao Tse-tung and his associates. The following section concerns itself with the evolution of Communist policy from its revolutionary roots through the New General Line of 1953–1954.

Against this background, the authors proceed with their analyses of the relation between the Chinese Communist regime and the people it rules; the nature of the Sino-Soviet alliance; the changes which the Peking regime has wrought in the Chinese economy, together with conditions and prospects for future economic growth; and the prospects for Communist China in terms of its top leadership, inner strength and weaknesses, and tactical goals.

After a judicious balancing of Chinese Communist strengths and weaknesses, the authors conclude that despite unfocused popular discontent within its borders, the Peking government maintains instruments of central and internal unity sufficient to keep its power secure. The regime's future stability, in turn, will depend largely upon four related factors—the policy and performance of Soviet Russia, Communist success in competition with Free Asia, the Peking government's progress in industrialization, and the unity and continuity of its top leadership.

In gathering the material from which these various analyses are drawn, the authors have surveyed and interpreted a large part of the research materials available on modern China. The historical section is not as strong as the accessible data should have made possible, but in their probing of contemporary China the authors have proceeded with imagination and deftness. Here one regrets only that sufficient distinction is not always made between assertions that are supported by evidence and those which remain essentially hypothetical.

It should be pointed out that two chapters—those dealing with economic reconstruction and control and with conditions and prospects for economic growth—differ from most of the other parts of the book in that they present material which is, to a large degree, a new contribution to knowledge.

ROBERT C. NORTH.

Hoover Institute.

A Study of Bolshevism. BY NATHAN LEITES. (Glencoe: The Free Press. 1903. Pp. 639. $6.50.)

Ritual of Liquidation: The Case of the Moscow Trials. BY NATHAN LEITES AND ELSA BERNAUT. (Glencoe: The Free Press. 1954. Pp. xi, 515. $6.50.)

These studies, sponsored by the RAND Corporation, constitute major additions to our understanding of Bolshevik thought and action.

Democratic statesmen, casual visitors, engineers, and foreign Communists —each in his varied but limited contact with Soviet society and politics—have been driven by their experiences sooner or later to reflect on the peculiar modes of thought displayed by the Bolsheviks with whom they happen to deal. At times Soviet wielders of some authority seem, even charmingly and disarmingly, like human beings from other cultures of our time; or, more frequently, they assert aggressively the absolute demands of their ideology and system, as if they feared to question any part or detail. These and similar observations crop up constantly in any report on "dealing with the Russians." It has remained for a talented, imaginative and indefatigable investigator, Nathan Leites, to undertake to embrace the entire body of Bolshevik thought and motivations in *A Study of Bolshevism* and thus to make explicit the interplay of doctrine and action within the Soviet system.

Many observers have been struck by the Soviet emphasis on the "party line" as the only correct though wavering median between incorrect opposites. And many have commented on the party's alternate insistence on remaining true to a rigid program and on exercising leadership over the non-party masses for purposes not shared by those "masses." The combination of a belief in determinism with an extreme tension of will, coupled with a fear of failure and annihilation, has also been found, in some measure, in Islam, in periods of expansion. The functions of resistance, attack, retreat, and temporary compromise have their parallels in classical military strategy. What is unique in Leites' analysis is the masterful way in which he has identified, as though from within the Bolshevik mind, the general range of aims, techniques, and situations which Bolsheviks are trained to expect and to cope with.

Perhaps to ward off some unjustified criticisms of his earlier summary of Bolshevik thinking (*The Operational Code of the Politburo*, 1951), Leites emphasizes that his present work cannot serve to predict a Soviet choice of policy in any given situation. He need not be embarrassed at having progressed so short a distance toward the science of prediction in human affairs! It will be sufficient if at least several tens of thousands of experts and commentators, concerned in some degree with analyzing and predicting Soviet actions, take advantage of this unique guide to the nature of the Bolshevik way of thinking.

Ritual of Liquidation studies a special and important application of the Bolshevik way of thought. By definition, this investigation by Leites and Bernaut is concentrated on the "demonstration trials," which have been organized periodically by the Soviet regime and its satellites. Although the great climax of trials came in 1936–38, with the self-castigation exacted by Stalin from many of his former rivals for power, the authors rightly draw the parallel between these major Soviet trials and the Rajk, Kostov, and Beria trials since 1948. If the psychology which dictated the origin, course, and outcome of the "liquidation trials" should appear remote in time, it is only necessary to recall that, arriving at Belgrade in May, 1955, Khrushchev promptly and eagerly disclosed that the entire Soviet "misunderstanding" with Tito, since June, 1948, had been due to the "fabrications" cooked up by Beria and Abakumov, acting as "enemies of the people" and "agents of imperialism."

Ritual of Liquidation examines with great precision the purposes and methods of the political trial within the Bolshevik system. It unravels with delicacy the confusion between thought and word, word and action, action and effect. Possibly it over-intellectualizes the motives of those "Old Bolsheviks" who accepted the "deal" and became, in part, cooperative partners in the judicial spectacle. How far "over-compliance" by the accused with the demands of the prosecutor for self-abasement was actually understood by those present as a tacit rejection of the accusation remains doubtful; those who remembered the pre-Stalinist version of Bolshevik history were by then few, weak, and afraid.

One small detail: Stefanov, the second most important victim of the Sofia trial of 1949, may or may not have been "a prominent illegal Party member" from 1932 to 1935. In any case, he was, at that time, legally and publicly, the Assistant Director of the Statistical Bureau of the Kingdom of Bulgaria, which published very extensive and competent reports on all aspects of the Bulgarian economy. Since little if any of this information was "secret," Stefanov was presumably engaged in carrying out his administrative duties by furnishing information to visitors requesting it (p. 362), rather than serving as an "agent of British Intelligence."

PHILLIP E. MOSELY.

Columbia University.

Federalism: Mature and Emergent. EDITED BY ARTHUR W. MACMAHON. (Garden City: Doubleday and Co. 1955. Pp. xi. 557. $7.50.)

This symposium is one of a series that diffuses the benefits of the bicentennial conferences held at Columbia University. It brings together essays by twenty-two distinguished contributors, economists and lawyers as well as political scientists. Perhaps not since the *Federalist* papers has so much insight, wisdom and breadth of perspective on the subject been compacted in a single volume.

Federalism is a loose concept. Its essential tests are all matters of degree and its practical manifestations are numberless. This symposium, for all its penetration into detail, is therefore appropriately selective rather than encyclopedic. Part I, on the nature and role of federalism, groups five essays broadly introductory: a masterly survey by the editor, pointing up the inherent paradox of nationalizing impulses that operate both cohesively and divisively; a reflective review of British commonwealth and colonial experience by K. C. Wheare, who suggests that the will or willingness to try to form a new and more inclusive nationality is the basic test of the practicability of federalism; a note of doubt from the late Franz Neumann as to whether federalism has any inherent advantages over unitary systems for promoting freedom; an emphasis by John Fischer on the need for balanced powers and concurrent majorities if federalism is to work satisfactorily; and a reminder from Adolf Berle, Jr. (who seems to use "federal" to mean "national") that modern corporations organize economic power on a scale comparable to that of federal states.

Part II, "Basic Controls in a Maturing System," deals entirely with American experience, except for Arthur Holcombe's illuminating comparative study of the coercion of states in a federal system. Herbert Wechsler and David Truman show how the states and the political parties tend to keep the character of our government in actual operation far more decentralized than current judicial interpretations of national powers require. Paul A. Freund and Henry M. Hart, Jr., in the most technical section of the book, treat the courts and the law with a learning disciplined to philosophical use. Although the general teaching of Part II is that the maintenance and allocation of divided powers depend more on political than on judicial processes, Hart is effective in urging that the courts, by virtue of their detachment and training, are better equipped than Congress—indeed can do what Congress has shown it cannot do—for dealing systematically with the technical intricacies of federal jurisdiction. This view gets support from the outcome, if not from the argument, of Paul Hays' case study of the mess Congress has made of the boundaries of national authority in labor relations. Part II concludes with Noel Dowling's sensible disposition of the Bricker amendment, coupled with an admonition that the President, in his conduct of foreign relations, has a duty to preserve the federal system.

Part III, "Functional Channels of Relationship," consists chiefly of illustrative studies of the operation of federalism in the fields of agricultural policy, by John Gaus; land management and water resources, by Charles McKinley; and trade regulation, by Milton Handler. Edward Weidner follows with an effort, based on the Minnesota studies, to relate the degree of federal-state cooperation in decision-making to the success of state administration of national policies; and Roy Blough then makes an acute and comprehensive review of interlevel fiscal relations, concluding that there is "no overall solution to the fiscal problems of federalism . . . we must be prepared to live with a permanently unsatisfactory situation" (p. 404), which, however, is still better than any of the available alternatives proposed.

Considering the scope of Parts II and III, some discussion of state-local relations would have been welcome; this was omitted because another of the bicentennial volumes deals with metropolitan problems.

Part IV, "Supranational Union in Western Europe," makes a sharp break in subject matter and locale. William Diebold, Jr., Ingvar Svennilson and Tom Charlton Clark review the progress and problems of European economic integration generally, and of the Coal and Steel Community in particular, and the applicability of federal models for supranational institutions. Robert R. Bowie and Carl J. Friedrich, who edited the *Studies in Federalism*, published last year and prepared in conjunction with the European Movement, conclude the volume with a discussion of the relevance of federal experience and theory to the incredibly complex problems of a European Political Community. This Part was conceived and written in the mood of mixed hope and foreboding that prevailed prior to the French rejection of the EDC. It contrasts with the evident faith in the continuing virtues of the federal system for the United States that characterizes the authors in Parts II and III.

"In the formative stage of federalism . . . ," writes Professor Macmahon, "the desperate need is a modicum of union where unity is impossible" (p. 3). The remark is perhaps as applicable to the formation of a symposium. What makes this one so notably successful an example of coherence and cohesion is the skill and perception of the editor, who leads off each Part with a full scale essay of his own, drawing on the Arden House conference discussions for which the papers served as background, as well as on his incomparable command of the subject.

HARVEY C. MANSFIELD.

The Ohio State University.

The Nation and States, Rivals or Partners? BY WILLIAM ANDERSON. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1955. Pp. xvi, 263. $3.75.)

This is a "working paper" on American federalism. It was drafted for the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and is now published, in an expanded form, for both the Commission and the lay reader. It will remain an essential working paper for political scientists for a long time to come.

At the outset Professor Anderson states his firmly held beliefs about the strengths of the American federal system of government and of the people for whom and through whom this complex of governments operates. He looks for some changes to take place in the form and possibly in the substance of the government and in intergovernmental relationships with the passing years, and he provides a series of tests against which the citizen can gauge each suggested change. In these early pages he completes a setting of the stage for the body of the study—and for his later appraisals and recommendations—with a survey of current disputes and conflicts. And then he goes back to the nation's beginning.

This reviewer knows of no work that details so well—and in so brief a space—the supremely important decisions taken between 1787 and 1789 for the construction of the nation. Professor Anderson views "the adoption of the Constitution by the people, with its provision for a strong national government, [as] one of the greatest acts of constructive republican centralization the world has ever witnessed" (p. 237). From this beginning the author proceeds with a step-by-step outline of the process through which the United States created the fact as well as the doctrine of national supremacy, a process he finds culminating with the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment. "I believe [this entire study is highly personal] that the citizenship clause in the Fourteenth Amendment establishes beyond question the United States as one nation, with one body of citizens, and with national supremacy over all parts of the national territory under national popular sovereignty" (p. 100).

The issues the nation has faced following the Civil War are paraded against a background of social change. We look into the fight over the national income tax and the significance of the resulting decision. Too, there is a word about national action in regard to liquor and woman suffrage and the constitutional heresies those decisions laid to rest. Here are woven together into an intelligble pattern such issues as the problem of the power to spend for the national welfare, federal participation in activities at levels where states and counties earlier had acted, and the real significance of federal aid.

The author includes a list of the various areas of government and politics where he finds broad national interests and concludes that in each case where such an interest exists there is a duty imposed on the national government "to act either to remove or prevent an evil or to promote a good" (p. 147). He examines the record and finds our big government more stable than our little governments—more responsive to people's needs, more able and willing to protect minorities, and more effectively administered. He finds the national government to be more the people's government than that of states and cities. That Congress has not crippled the states is demonstrated by the record. What is more, the nation has aided and strengthened the states. Where nation and states have joined in administrative enterprises, cooperation has been the rule. Congress has proved to be a better defender of states than state legislatures and governors have been of cities and counties. "I doubt also that anyone can show that state and local governments have, on the average, been more virtuous and high-minded in their actions or more mindful of the dignity of man or of the liberties of individuals, or have maintained higher standards of public morality, than the national government of the United States" (p. 243). And before concluding his study, the author gives us his list of "the great achievements in politics and government that have made the United States what it is today." He finds that in most of these achievements "the national government has had a leading part" (p. 239). The list is impressive.

What of the future? Professor Anderson sums up his view in a single sentence. " . . . no fundamental change is needed in the relations between the national and state governments: no weakening of the national government, no great shifting of functions, no important reallocation of revenues or of taxing power, no basic change in federal-aid programs or policies, no diminution of the autonomy of either the national or state governments" (p. 244).

CHARLES AIKIN.

University of California (*Berkeley*).

BOOK NOTES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

The Inter-University Case Program: Cases in Public Administration and Policy Formation. (University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press.)

No. 9. *The New York City Health Centers.* By Herbert Kaufman. (1952. Pp. 23.)

No. 10. *The Displaced Career Employee Program.* By James E. Drury. (1952. Pp. 43.)

No. 11. *The UN Publications Board.* By Herbert Kaufman. (1952. Pp. 33.)

No. 12. *The New York Farm Labor Camps.* By Ronald M. Stout. (1953. Pp. 76.)

No. 13. *Wilderness Sanctuary.* Revised edition. By Russell P. Andrews. (1954. Pp. 12.)

No. 14. *Reorganizing the Massachusetts Department of Conservation.* By Thomas H. Eliot. (1953. Pp. 48.)

No. 15. *The Gainesville School Problem.* By Frank T. Adams, Jr. (1953. Pp. 12.)

No. 16. *Three Cases in Field Administration.* (1953. Pp. 31.)

No. 17. *The Whittier Narrows Dam.* By Donald E. Pearson. (1953. Pp. 36.)

No. 18. *Taxing the Southern Railroad in Alabama.* By Valerie A. and Chester B. Earle. (1953. Pp. 52.)

No. 19. *The Regional Information Officer.* By Martin Kriesberg. (1953. Pp. 5.)

No. 20. *The Promotion of Lem Merrill.* By Chester B. and Valerie A. Earle. (1953. Pp. 60.)

No. 21. *The Department of Commerce Field Service.* By Kathryn Smul Arnow. (1954. Pp. 33.)

No. 22. *The Van Waters Case.* By Thomas H. Eliot. (1954. Pp. 50.)

No. 23. *The Michigan State Director of Elections.* By Glendon A. Schubert, Jr. (1954. Pp. 65.)

No. 24. *The Army Flies the Mails.* By Paul D. Tillett. (1954. Pp. 80.)

No. 25. *The Battle of Blue Earth County.* Revised edition. By Paul N. Ylvisaker. *The Battle of Harrison County.* By Gary Brazier. (1955. Pp. 28.)

The case studies listed above were published in pamphlet form during the past three years by the Inter-University Case Program (ICP) in which some 45 colleges and universities are subscribing members. Twenty-eight of the 31 cases which preceded these were collected and published in 1952 in a volume edited by Harold Stein entitled *Public Administration and Policy Development.*

The emphasis in the cases being reviewed is on state and local administration and on federal field administration. More than half of the cases deal with state and local government (as contrasted with the early cases which predominantly were concerned with the federal government), and most of the remaining cases deal with federal field administration.

The cases are unusually well-written by carefully-selected writers who have had close access to the situations which they describe. The editorial standards for content have been high, though the editors have avoided the natural temptation to standardize the structure of the cases.

The longest of the studies, *The New York Farm Labor Camps* (No. 12), runs to 76 single-spaced pages. This reviewer finds the shorter cases most useful for teaching purposes. The 12-page *Wilderness Sanctuary* (No. 13) is about right. Most of the studies are too long, even though they tend to be shorter than the cases which preceded them. A tougher editorial policy with regard to cutting and condensing would have increased their usefulness.

A more obvious editorial failure is the lack of a standardized format. Several forms of the photo-offset process appear to have been used; some of the typing is double-spaced, some single-spaced; some of the pages are double-columned, some single-columned; in one of the cases, the line-spacing changes in the middle of the case; a 32-page double-spaced case is bound, a 42-page single-spaced case is not. These seemingly irrational variations, of course, are more irritating than serious. Perhaps the variations are due to the fact that the ICP has had three directors and two publishers since 1952. There are no variations as to size, but the 8½-by-11-inch page is awkward to handle and difficult to read.

The availability of the public administration cases has greatly influenced the teaching of public administration. Almost all of the introductory public administration courses make some use of the cases. Teachers of these courses use the cases to supplement and illustrate the standard texts, some requiring all students to read selected cases, others requiring students to prepare reports on individually assigned cases, and still others recommending but not requiring the reading of cases.

The use of cases in the teaching of public administration is doing much to enliven a subject which many students have considered to be exceedingly dull. It gives students the feeling of actual participation in decision-making and in the administrative process. The cases communicate a sense of the pressures under which administrators act. They encourage an attitude of skepticism concerning principles and an emphasis on the human element.

The cases are useful in many courses outside of the field of public administration. Teachers of courses in American government, state and local government, public law, international organization, government and business, political parties, and conservation will find individual cases which will be of great value. Teachers outside of political science, too, in such fields as law, economics, education, and agriculture, will find some of the cases to be excellent for their purposes.

In future cases, it is hoped that the ICP will experiment with variations on the decision-centered case. Certainly more cases on management processes would be welcomed by teachers of public administration and more cases in the broader field of political science would be welcomed by teachers of political science.—GEORGE A. WARP, *University of Minnesota.*

The Western Public: 1952 and Beyond. BY ALFRED DEGRAZIA (Stanford: Stanford University Press. 1954. Pp. ix, 226.)

The Western Public first came to this reviewer's attention when he saw a copy in the hands of a party politician who does not have time to read many books. Yet the condition of that volume was such that obviously it had been read well, and subsequent conversation established the fact. Alfred DeGrazia's book is both a scholarly contribution to the field of political science and a working manual for the "lowliest" precinct worker.

Principal sources of data for the project were the University of Michigan Survey Research Center's Western state interviews conducted as a part of its 1952 election study. The analysis includes attempts to measure the quality of party regularity of Westerners, to illuminate the Westerner's reactions to Eisenhower and Stevenson, to examine and classify the Western issues of 1952, to see how Westerners got their political information and whether such information had any effect, to evaluate the factors determining political behavior, and in summary to answer the question, "The West: Is It Peculiar?"

Though some may have expected such a study to establish clearly that the West was "politically different," the author finds that political similarities of the Western states to the rest of the country are the rule, dissimilarities the exception. "Even (Los) Angelenos, although they are targets of extravagant comment from all sides, react to political events with remarkable normality."

Often the author challenges long-accepted notions about political behavior, as in these examples:

> The popular impression that Westerners do not attach themselves to the party label is erroneous. The West has a greater proportion of Strong Democrats than any other region except the South; it had a greater proportion of Strong Republicans than the Northeast section of the country; and . . . fewer Independents than the Northeast. . . .
>
> In the West in 1952 the most fertile sources of Republican strength were urban people with a big-city background and rural people with a small-town background. The most fertile sources of Democratic strength were rural people with a farm background and urban people also with a farm background.

More often, however, the findings support or further develop already established ideas about voters.

Of those seeking a glimpse at the future, the following will be most comforted by the tables and interpretations in *The Western Public:* first, a moderate Democrat or an Eisenhower Republican as distinguished from any kind of political extremist; second, a Democrat as he views his party's long-range prospects as distinguished from a Republican speculating about his party's future; third, a politician who thinks primarily of how to win in the existing platform-robbing, two-party system as distinguished from one who hopes to centralize and discipline the parties into standing for clear alternatives of principle; and fourth, one who can visualize the survival of representative democracy without every voter's having to become a political sophisticate and/or party worker.

The most substantial criticism which can be levelled at the book is that it is an attempt to deal with *the* Western public and not the Western *publics*. This is, however, a limitation which the author imposed upon himself in his original decision to confine himself to the Michigan Survey Research Center's 452 pre-election and 210 post-election Western state samples. In spite of this shortcoming, the book is a noteworthy contribution to research on political behavior.—Ivan Hinderaker, *University of California* (Los Angeles).

Prejudice, War and the Constitution. By Jacobus ten Broek, Edward N. Barnhart, and Floyd W. Matson. (Berkeley: University of California Press. 1954. Pp. xii, 408. $5.00.)

One of a series of volumes depicting the story of the American governmental policies and actions relative to Japanese and Japanese-Americans on the West Coast, this volume treats most cogently with the administrative and judicial aspects of the problem.

In the range of their writings, political scientists evidence distinct polarities. There are those who aspire to dispassionate description and evaluation of consistencies and deviations and those less concerned with "science" and more with the "political." These are the priests of systematic doctrines and value patterns. *Prejudice, War and the Constitution* bristles with indignation and glitters with citations inconveniently arranged at the end of the volume.

Focus is sharpest in analyzing the pattern of judicial avoidance of fundamental issues. No very positive doctrine of judicial review is projected beyond that of consistency with approved precedent, and the criticism that the judges of the time found ways to recognize the values of contemporary political leadership may be harsh when it is kept in mind that the men were selected by presidents able to see a high similarity between the public good and executive political policy.

The justices of the highest court dealt with a national policy, even if a perverse one, having legislative and executive approval and capped by military leadership in the highest esteem. The decoration of General DeWitt for his policy statements and conduct, when put in juxtaposition with the prosecution and defense in the Nuremburg trials, creates a curious precedent for historians seeking clarification of the American philosophy. The Army might temper its leaders to leave policy to the civil authorities and illuminate its lessons from the judgments at Nuremberg.

The exotic flower of treatment of Japanese-Americans is, at best, a weed in the lush gardens of New Dealism. This weed seems to have flourished with surprising vigor. Men who revere the traditions and ideals of our system can only hope that it is not toxic.—Spencer D. Parratt, *Syracuse University.*

Politics in the Press: An Analysis of Press Content in 1952 Senatorial Campaigns. By LeRoy C. Ferguson and Ralph H. Smuckler. (East Lansing: Governmental Research Bureau, Michigan State College. 1954. Pp. 100.)

This slim volume is a modest but creditable first publication in what the Governmental Research Bureau of Michigan State College describes as a "program of systematic research in the political system with the aim of contributing to empirical theory and research techniques." The narrow focus of the study, which prohibits many generalizable conclusions, reflects the limitations of funds and time, not of imagination or skills on the part of the coauthors. What is proposed is accomplished, namely an investigation of the political content of a large sample of the daily and weekly press in two states with reference to three senatorial campaigns in 1952. The subtitle is somewhat misleading in this respect; the three campaigns covered are those of Benton-Purtell and Ribicoff-Bush in Connecticut and Fairchild-McCarthy in Wisconsin. The stated objectives are to describe and evaluate the campaign issues and appeals as they were reflected in the pages of the newspapers and to discover whether the partisan position of the press affected its presentation of campaign news. In the achievement of those objectives the authors carefully employ the quantitative method of content analysis, keep the reader fairly and fully informed of the limits of the research design and methodology, and restrict their conclusions to those which the data will support.

The major findings relate to three separate areas. First, most appeals to the voter found in the press referred to the personality and character of the candidates and to other non-policy themes rather than to their positions on governmental policy. Even when policy issues were the basis for appeal, the opposing contestants, passing each other like ships in the night, usually stressed different issues. Secondly, common party affiliation led to no common emphasis on the various policy issues. Indeed, most of the senatorial candidates stressed "independence" rather than relating their candidacies to their party or to their party's presidential nominee. Thirdly, the partisan loyalties of the newspapers clearly affected their treatment of headlines and, to a lesser though still noticeable extent, their news coverage of the campaign.

Although unable to resist some speculative comments on the disturbing implications of these findings for the theory of democracy, the authors wisely refrain from constructing a mountain of extensive conclusions from a molehill of partial evidence. The study ends appropriately with suggestions for future research, with special reference to additional analyses of the press and other media, supplemented by systematic interviewing designed to determine the extent to which the political content of the mass media may affect the outcome of elections.—ALLAN P. SINDLER, *Yale University.*

Public Policy: A Yearbook of the Graduate School of Public Administration, 1954. Volume V. EDITED BY CARL J. FRIEDRICH AND J. KENNETH GALBRAITH. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1954. Pp. viii, 420.)

It is a pleasure to report that the over-all quality of the research papers and reports in this volume justifies again the decision to renew publication of the *Public Policy* series broken off by the war in 1942. Six of the fourteen papers fall under the head of "Fiscal and Monetary Policy"; three deal with "Planning and Resources Policy"; two are monographs which analyze limited aspects of "Anti-Trust Policy and Industrial Organization" and two other monographs deal with "Politics: Legislation and Parties." One is autobiographical, a lecture delivered by Eugene Meyer at the School reviewing his governmental experience with the War Finance Corporation, the Federal Farm Loan Board, the Federal Reserve System, and the R.F.C. In general, the papers are analytical rather than descriptive; they use theoretical concepts as devices for selecting and testing data rather than for upholding preconceived verbal or ideological positions; they assume the interpenetration of economics and politics rather than their separation.

Written by men who vary from graduate students to full professors and practicing administrators, the contributions are not of uniform quality, and the specialized interests represented range so widely that it is unlikely that many students of government and economics would be professionallly interested in more than three or four of the topics considered. But of the fourteen, so far as this reviewer is concerned, only two are of doubtful value; this is a high batting average for any editorial operation. The volume is a worthy testimonial to the seminar program of the Harvard Graduate School of Public Administration.—AVERY LEISERSON, *Vanderbilt University.*

The Roosevelt Leadership, 1933–1945. BY EDGAR EUGENE ROBINSON. (New York: J. B. Lippincott Co. 1955. Pp. 461. $6.00.)

This book belongs with the growing body of literature on the New Deal "betrayal." The author states (in his introduction) that "When he [Roosevelt] ceased to lead, the effect of his years in power was manifested in a weakened Constitutional system, in imperiled national security, in diminished national morale, in deteriorated political morality, and in an overburdened economy. Powerful beyond comprehension, because of the power of the American people, President Roosevelt had an important part in destroying dictators representing the entrenched totalitarianism of the few, only to leave his nation exposed at home and abroad to a totalitarianism of the masses more terrible than any foe yet faced by a free people." This is an odd judgment for a work that was commissioned (in the bequest of a wealthy Philadelphian) as an appraisal of Franklin D. Roosevelt without "fear, favor and prejudice." It is something of a comment on the times that we commission "objectivity" regardless of the nature of the problem or its difficulty.

Professor Robinson's thesis (with allowances for oversimplification) is that the United States in recent times faced two choices epitomized by two political leaders, Herbert Hoover and Franklin D. Roosevelt. The former stood for the alleged "staples" of the American political heritage—elitism, sound administration, a new "liberalism," and social rationalism. The latter stood for dramatized and demagogic leadership, pragmatism, opportunism, collectivism, and "alien" influence.

The American people in their folly chose Roosevelt, the gifted political artist who led them charismatically down the road to ruin.

Part I consists of some twenty chapters that make use of some of the best available sources. In these the author traces Roosevelt's career from his election in 1932 to his untimely death in 1945. The bulk of these chapters is devoted to a discussion of Roosevelt and foreign policy. Part II consists mainly in a useful annotation of the bibliography on Roosevelt to date.

A brief review can only highlight a few aspects of this complex and often strange work. Within the framework of the aforementioned thesis, there are some shrewd insights into Roosevelt's character and techniques of leadership. Strikingly little attention is devoted to concrete policies of the New Deal—TVA, banking legislation, the Fair Labor Standards Act, and AAA. The Roosevelt inner circle is one of the *bête noires*, as is progressive education. These and pragmatism are charged with injecting the un-American influence into the New Deal. Thus, "An underlying weakness of his [Roosevelt's] leadership lay in his acceptance of the pragmatic approach to the solution of both domestic and foreign problems. In essence, it was a refusal to take the stand for a distinctively American approach to the basic problems of capitalism. No political program that emerged with the Roosevelt administration was distinctly the expression of the American tradition." This pragmatism, according to the author, made Roosevelt less able to oppose fascism and communism. Many readers will be shocked to learn that this philosophy regarded by many as uniquely American is labeled un-American.

When one begins a work of this kind with a fixed bias, and then attempts some detached appraisals, the result is a kind of tragi-comedy. This book will be criticized for its value premises more than for its facts. An unbiased interpretation of Roosevelt's leadership may never be done. What we may hope for at least is a more profound understanding of the man, the policies, and the methods, within the framework of their context. Judgments which so distort reality that such empathy is impossible deprive this work of a claim for weighty consideration.—LESTER G. SELIGMAN, *University of Oregon.*

The Papers of Thomas Jefferson: Volume 10, 22 June to 31 December, 1786. BY JULIAN P. BOYD, EDITOR, MINA R. BRYAN AND FREDRICH AANDAHL, ASSOCIATE EDITORS. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1954. Pp. xxx, 654. $10.00.)

This volume contains, among many subjects of Jefferson's unlimited curiosity, his experience in attempting to make commercial treaties with European powers. He was constantly told that there was no use of making such treaties because the states would pay no attention to them. This experience caused Jefferson to recommend that we must be a unity in foreign affairs and commerce. This idea was to become the chief basis of our federalism in the Constitution of 1787.

Michigan's Recounts for Governor, 1950 and 1952: A Systematic Analysis of Election Error. BY SAMUEL J. ELDERSVELD AND ALBERT A. APPLEGATE. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 1954. Pp. viii, 176.)

"A case study of the size, distribution, and factors related to administrative and balloting errors in the 1950 gubernatorial election in Michigan, as revealed by the state-wide recount of that year," together with a less thorough analysis of the 1952 recount. Many persons assisted in this painstaking and tedious work.

The American Vice-Presidency: New Look. BY IRVING G. WILLIAMS. (New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc. 1954. Pp. x, 82. $.95.)

This work, one in the new series of Doubleday Short Studies in Political Science, is a modest attempt to concentrate on the office of the vice-presidency itself, in addition to devoting attention to the more usual themes of presidential succession and the function of presiding over the Senate.

Pennsylvania Politics and the Growth of Democracy, 1740–1776. BY THEODORE THAYER. (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Historical and Museum Commission. 1953. Pp. x, 227.)

Essentially a political history of mid-eighteenth century Pennsylvania which begins with a consideration of Penn's Frame of Government and carries the reader through the domestic and external politics of Pennsylvania from 1739 until American independence, stressing the period after 1760.

American Politics and the Party System. BY HUGH A. BONE. (New York, Toronto, London: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. 1955. Pp. vii, 670. $5.25.)

The second edition of a textbook which

first appeared in 1949. Considerable revision has been made, taking into account recent events and the results of the latest research findings in the field of American politics and parties.

Politics in the United States: Readings in Political Parties and Pressure Groups. EDITED BY HENRY A. TURNER. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. 1955. Pp. xi, 426. $5.25.)

An excellent selection of supplementary reading materials on American politics, public opinion, pressure groups, and the party system from the writings of a long list of recent contributors to the subject.

The Washington Papers: Basic Selections from the Public and Private Writings of George Washington. EDITED BY SAUL PADOVER. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955. Pp. 430. $4.75.)

A judicious selection from Washington's public and private writings with a brief introduction by the editor. Parts I and II set forth, respectively, personal and political writings; Part III contains a selection of maxims, mottoes, and brief opinions.

Franklin D. Roosevelt as Governor of New York. BY BERNARD BELLUSH. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1955. Pp. xiii, 327. $5.00.)

A scholarly study of the New York governorship of Franklin D. Roosevelt based upon hitherto unpublished portions of the official and personal correspondence of the subject. The influence of Al Smith and the foreshadowing of the New Deal in Roosevelt's gubernatorial policies are stressed.

The Roosevelt Family of Sagamore Hill. BY HERMANN HAGEDORN. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1954. Pp. 435. $5.00.)

An intimate view of the family life of Theodore Roosevelt from 1887 until his death in 1919.

Simeon Eben Baldwin: Lawyer, Social Scientist, Statesman. BY FREDERICK H. JACKSON. (New York: Columbia University, King's Crown Press. 1955. Pp. xiv, 278. $5.00.)

The life of an eminent Connecticut lawyer, legal scholar and law teacher, writer, judge, and governor, who participated in the founding and was an early president of the American Political Science Association.

The Life and Writings of Frederick Douglass. Volume IV. Reconstruction and After. BY PHILIP S. FONER. (New York: International Publishers. 1955. Pp. 524. $5.00.)

The fourth and last volume of *The Life and Writings of Frederick Douglass*, which covers the last phase of the career of this well-known 19th-century Negro leader. The first 154 pages provide a résumé of Douglass' life from 1865 to 1895; the bulk of the volume reproduces the subject's writings and speeches during the period.

Opinion Polls on National Leaders. Final Technical Report. Series 1953. Institute Report #6, 15 November 1953. BY HAROLD ORLANS. (Philadelphia and Washington Institute for Research in Human Relations. Pp. xviii, 228.)

A loose-leaf, multigraphed final report of the Institute, which reviewed "the public's attitudes toward national political, military, business, and labor leaders and their respective institutions, as disclosed by opinion polls from 1935–1953." It was prepared for the Office of Naval Research, U. S. Navy.

The Reputation of the American Businessman. BY SIGMUND DIAMOND. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1955. Pp. 182. $4.00.)

An examination of the changing attitudes of the American public toward business men of great wealth as elicited from the comments and opinions expressed in newspapers, magazines, and other publications, particularly at the times of their deaths. The men dealt with are Stephen Girard, John Jacob Astor, Cornelius Vanderbilt, J. P. Morgan, John D. Rockefeller, and Henry Ford.

Andrew Jackson: Symbol for an Age. BY JOHN WILLIAM WARD. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1955. Pp. xii, 274. $4.75.)

A brief analysis by a university teacher of English of Andrew Jackson as an embodiment and symbol of the age to which his name has been attached.

Tom Watson: Agrarian Rebel. BY VANN WOODWARD. (New York: Rinehart & Co., Inc. 1955. Pp. xvi, 518, $5.00.)

The reprinting of a biography of a famous Southern politician originally published in 1938.

SELECTED ARTICLES AND DOCUMENTS ON
AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

FRANKLIN L. BURDETTE
University of Maryland

ARTICLES AND BOOKLETS

National Government

DeConde, Alexander. William Vans Murray's *Political Sketches:* A Defense of the American Experiment. *Mississippi Valley Historical Review.* March, 1955.

Schwartz, Charles P., Jr. American Immigration Policy. *Columbia Law Review.* March, 1955.

State Government

Collins, John R., and David L. MacGregor. Recent Developments in the Legislative Redistricting Struggle in Wisconsin. *Wisconsin Law Review.* January, 1955.

Dauer, Manning J., and William C. Havard. The Florida Constitution of 1885—A Critique. *University of Florida Law Review.* Spring, 1955.

Murray, William G. State Action for Better Assessments. *State Government.* April, 1955.

Rothenberg, Leon. State Budgets—1955. *State Government.* May, 1955.

Scigliano, Robert G. Michigan Legislative Report, 1954. Governmental Research Center, Michigan State College. 1955.

Smith, David W. The Constitutionality of Legislative Councils. *Western Political Quarterly.* March, 1955.

Taxation in New Hampshire. [Symposium.] University of New Hampshire, Durham. 1955.

Van Alstyne, W. Scott, Jr. Land Transfer and Recording in Wisconsin: A Partial History—Part I. *Wisconsin Law Review.* January, 1955.

Local Government

Grant, Daniel R. Urban and Suburban Nashville: A Case Study in Metropolitanism. *Journal of Politics.* February, 1955.

Graves, W. Brooke. Some Current Problems in State and Local Government. Bureau of Public Administration, University of Mississippi. 1955.

Haar, Charles M. "In Accordance with a Comprehensive Plan" [Zoning]. *Harvard Law Review.* May, 1955.

Hattery, Lowell H. Metropolitan Area Council. *County Officer.* April, 1955.

Land Planning in a Democracy. [Symposium.] *Law and Contemporary Problems.* Spring, 1955.

Lawson, Harry O. Municipal Finance—A Study of Third Class Cities. Governmental Research Center, University of Kansas. 1955.

Leadership Functions of the Manager. *Public Management.* March, 1955.

Local-State Relations in Indiana: Proposed Charter Making Powers for Municipalities. *Indiana Law Journal.* Winter, 1955.

Norton, Clark F. Home Rule Fight Fails [in Indiana]. *National Municipal Review.* May, 1955.

Pepper, Henry C. Legal Handbook for County Commissioners of Georgia. Association County Commissioners of Georgia. 1955.

Relations of the Manager with the Public. *Public Management.* April, 1955.

Slayton, William L. Urban Renewal—A Program for Cities. *Public Management.* April, 1955.

Stoner, John E. The Governing Board and the County Engineer. *County Officer.* March, 1955.

Trends in the City Manager Profession. *Public Management.* May, 1955.

Woodruff, Lloyd W. How to Make County Government Strong—A Lesson from Wisconsin Experiences. *County Officer.* March, 1955.

Intergovernmental Relations

Applicability of State Conflicts Rules When Issues of State Law Arise in Federal Courts. *Harvard Law Review.* May, 1955.

Clay, Lucius D. For an Adequate Highway System. *State Government.* April, 1955.

The Controversy over the President's New Ten-Year Highway Program. [Symposium.] *Congressional Digest.* May, 1955.

Gardner, Barbara C. State-Local Relations in Kansas: The State Department of Social Welfare. Governmental Research Center, University of Kansas. 1955.

Grant, Daniel R. The Government of Interstate Metropolitan Areas. *Western Political Quarterly.* March, 1955.

Paulsen, Monrad G. Foreign Law in Texas Courts. *Texas Law Review.* April, 1955.

Peterson, Val. The States and Civil Defense. *State Government.* April, 1955.

Scheffer, Walter F. State-County Administration of Highways in Wisconsin. *County Officer.* March, 1955.

Scoles, Eugene. F. Apportionment of Federal Estate Taxes and Conflict of Laws. *Columbia Law Review.* March, 1955.

Constitutional Law and Civil Liberties

Beisel, Albert R., Jr. Control Over Illegal Enforcement of the Criminal Law: Role of the Supreme Court. [Part II.] *Boston University Law Review.* January, 1955.

Beth, Loren P. The Case for Judicial Protection of Civil Liberties. *Journal of Politics.* February, 1955.

The Businessman and Civil Liberties. [Survey.] *Fortune.* May, 1955.

Constitutionality of Rebuttable Statutory Presumptions. *Columbia Law Review.* April, 1955.

Davis, Elbridge, and Harold A. Davis. Mr. Justice Horace Gray: Some Aspects of His Judicial Career. *American Bar Association Journal.* May, 1955.

Dixon, Robert G., Jr. The Doctrine of Separation of Powers and Federal Immunity Statutes. *George Washington Law Review.* April, 1955.

The Doctrine of Official Immunity under the Civil Rights Acts. *Harvard Law Review.* May, 1955.

Graham, Howard Jay. Our "Declaratory" Fourteenth Amendment. *Stanford Law Review.* December, 1954.

Grodzins, Morton. Making Un-Americans. *American Journal of Sociology.* May, 1955.

Hanson, Elisha. The Two Bulwarks of Liberty: A Free Press and an Independent Judiciary. *American Bar Association Journal.* March, 1955.

Jaffe, Louis L. Mr. Justice Jackson. *Harvard Law Review.* April, 1955.

Kort, Fred. An Alternative Constitutional Justification of Current Regulatory Taxation. *Virginia Law Review.* May, 1955.

Noonan, John T., Jr. Inferences from the Invocation of the Privilege Against Self-Incrimination. *Virginia Law Review.* April, 1955.

O'Conor, John F. The Fifth Amendment: Should a Good Friend Be Abused? *American Bar Association Journal.* April, 1955.

Parker, John J. Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson: Meeting the Challenge to Law and Order. *American Bar Association Journal.* April, 1955.

Price, Warren C. Reflections on the Trial of John Peter Zenger. *Journalism Quarterly.* Spring, 1955.

Robert H. Jackson: 1892–1954. [Symposium.] *Columbia Law Review.* April, 1955.

Rovere, Richard H. The Kept Witnesses. *Harper's Magazine.* May, 1955.

Russell, James F. S. The Railroads in the "Conspiracy Theory" of the Fourteenth Amendment. *Mississippi Valley Historical Review.* March, 1955.

Schwartzman, Ruth, and Joseph Stein. Law of Personal Liberties. Oceana Publications. 1955.

State Police, Unconstitutionally Obtained Evidence and Section 242 of the Civil Rights Statute. *Stanford Law Review.* December, 1954.

Weidner, Paul A. Justice Jackson and the Judicial Function. *Michigan Law Review.* February, 1955.

Weiss, Leo. Justice Murphy and the Welfare Question. *Michigan Law Review.* February, 1955.

Westin, Alan F. A Critique of Civil Libertarian Reactions to the "Communist Problem." *Northwestern University Law Review.* March-April, 1955.

Judicial Administration and Law Enforcement

Ballantine, Arthur A. John M. Harlan for the Supreme Court. *Iowa Law Review.* Spring, 1955.

The Challenge of the Mass Trial. *Harvard Law Review.* April, 1955.

Desmond, Charles S. The Trowbridge Case: A Near Miscarriage of Justice. *American Bar Association Journal.* March, 1955.

Flandrick, John R. Revocation of Conditional Liberty—California and the Federal System. *Southern California Law Review.* February, 1955.

Green, Leon. Blindfolding the Jury. Part II. *Texas Law Review.* February, 1955.

Hogan, John C., ed. Joseph Story on Capital Punishment. *California Law Review.* March, 1955.

Klots, Allen T. The Selection of Judges and the Short Ballot. *Journal of the American Judicature Society.* February-April, 1955.

Levitt, Eugene E. Scientific Evaluation of the "Lie Detector." *Iowa Law Review.* Spring, 1955.

Mechem, John Leland. The Peasant in His Cottage: Some Comments on the Relative Hardship Doctrine in Equity. *Southern California Law Review.* February, 1955.

The Objects of Criminal Conspiracy—Inadequacies of State Law. *Harvard Law Review.* April, 1955.

Proof of the Corpus Delicti Aliunde the Defendant's Confession. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review.* March, 1955.

Ruud, Millard H. The Savings Clause—Some Problems in Construction and Drafting. *Texas Law Review.* Februry, 1955.

Sobeloff, Simon E. Attorney for the Government: The Work of the Solicitor General's Office. *American Bar Association Journal.* March, 1955.

Sufficiency of Circumstantial Evidence in a Criminal Case. *Columbia Law Review.* April, 1955.

Withdrawal of Guilty Pleas in the Federal Courts. *Columbia Law Review.* March, 1955.

Wright, Curtis, Jr. Adequacy of Instruction to the Jury: I. *Michigan Law Review.* February, 1955.

Public Administration and Administrative Law

Byers, Kenneth, John England, and Robert Coppock. Personnel Services for Local Government: The California Program. *Public Personnel Review.* April, 1955.

Collins, Patricia H. Administrative Procedure: The Conference Submits Its Final Report. *American Bar Association Journal.* April, 1955.

Colmen, Joseph G., G. O. Fiedler, and Laurence Kashdan. Management Improvement through Objective Supervisory Selection. *Public Personnel Review.* April, 1955.

Davis, Kenneth Culp. Ripeness of Governmental Action for Judicial Review. *Harvard Law Review.* May, 1955.

———. Standing to Challenge Governmental Action. *Minnesota Law Review.* March, 1955.

Dotson, Arch. The Emerging Doctrine of Privilege in Public Employment. *Public Administration Review.* Spring, 1955.

Gulick, Luther. Next Steps in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review.* Spring, 1955.

Judical Review of Reversals of Policy by Administrative Agencies. *Harvard Law Review.* May, 1955.

Otten, Dorothy W. How to Take a Civil Service Examination. *Public Personnel Review.* April, 1955.

Smith, Lincoln. Should Public Utility Commissioners Be Elected or Appointed? Part I. *Public Utilities Fortnightly.* April 28, 1955. Part II. *Ibid.* May 12, 1955.

Terry, Charles W. Teamwork in Recruiting and Selecting Employees. *Public Personnel Review.* April, 1955.

Terry, George W. The Proposed Texas Administrative Procedure Act. *Texas Law Review.* April, 1955.

Waldo, Dwight. The Study of Public Administration. Doubleday and Company. 1955.

Warner, Kenneth O. On Being a Better Boss. *State Government.* April, 1955.

Worthy, James C. The Problem of Patronage. *Good Government.* March-April, 1955.

Political Parties, Elections, and Public Opinion

Bagby, Wesley M. The "Smoke Filled Room" and the Nomination of Warren G. Harding. *Mississippi Valley Historical Review.* March, 1955.

Carter, Roy E., Jr. The Content Response Code: A Pre-testing Procedure. *Journalism Quarterly.* Spring, 1955.

Charles, Joseph. Hamilton and Washington: The Origins of the American Party System. *William and Mary Quarterly.* April, 1955.

Drucker, Peter F. Eleven Coming Issues in Politics. *Harper's Magazine.* June, 1955.

Ford, Pamela. Regulation of Campaign Finance. Bureau of Public Administration, University of California, Berkeley. 1955.

Guest, Lester. A New Training Method for Opinion Interviewers. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Fall, 1954.

Hathorn, Guy B. C. Bascom Slemp—Virginia Republican Boss, 1907–1932. *Journal of Politics.* May, 1955.

Key, V. O., Jr. A Theory of Critical Elections. *Journal of Politics.* February, 1955.

Lamson, Robert W. The Present Strains between Science and Government. *Social Forces.* May, 1955.

Mitau, G. Theodore. The Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party Schism of 1948. *Minnesota History.* Spring, 1955.

Neuberger, Richard L. My Wife Put Me in the Senate. *Harper's Magazine.* June, 1955.

Price, Hugh Douglas. The Negro and Florida Politics, 1944–1954. *Journal of Politics.* May, 1955.

Sampson, R. V. Lincoln Steffens: An Interpretation. *Western Political Quarterly.* March, 1955.

Schramm, Wilbur. Information Theory and

Mass Communication. *Journalism Quarterly.* Spring, 1955.

Simon, Herbert A. Bandwagon and Underdog Effects and the Possibility of Election. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Fall, 1954.

Stouffer, Samuel A. 1665 and 1954. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Fall, 1954.

White, Howard. Do American Colleges and Universities Encourage Their Faculties and Students to Participate Actively in Politics? *College and University.* April, 1955.

Economic and Social Functions

National Economy

Elliott, Norman. The New Forty-Niners: Uranium vs. Oil and Gas on the Public Domain. *Southern California Law Review.* February, 1955.

Federal Tax Issues in 1955. Committee for Economic Development. 1955.

Priest, A. J. G. Dixon-Yates and the Public Interest. *Virginia Law Review.* April, 1955.

Two Years of Republican Tax Policy and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. [Symposium.] *National Tax Journal.* March, 1955.

Business and Labor

Bunzel, John H. The General Ideology of American Small Business. *Political Science Quarterly.* March, 1955.

Decker, Kenneth. The Tourist Trade in California. Bureau of Public Administration, University of California, Berkeley. 1955.

Determination of Public Utility Rates in Ohio. Ohio Legislative Service Commission. 1955.

Emerzian, A. D. Joseph. An Evaluation of a State Tripartite Arbitration Agency. *Labor Law Journal.* April, 1955.

Graham, Donald K. Protection of Service Marks under the Lanham Act. *Virginia Law Review.* April, 1955.

Hale, G. E., and Rosemary D. Hale. Monopoly in Motion: Dynamic Economics in Antitrust Enforcement. *Virginia Law Review.* May, 1955.

Harris, Benjamin, Jr. The Model Business Corporation Act—Invitation to Irresponsibility? *Northwestern University Law Review.* March-April, 1955.

Hunt, John W., and Wilbur S. Legg. Public Utility Rates in Illinois: The Bell Cases. *Northwestern University Law Review.* March-April, 1955.

Krislov, Joseph. The NLRB on Craft Severance: One Year of American Potash. *Labor Law Journal.* May, 1955.

The Legal Effects of Proxy Voting. *Northwestern University Law Review.* March-April, 1955.

Levitan, Mortimer. Industrial Commissions: The Law, the Facts and the Record. *American Bar Association Journal.* March, 1955.

Markson, Martin. "To Cease Doing Business"—What Does It Mean? *Labor Law Journal.* April, 1955.

Morgan, Chester A. State Regulation of Internal Union Affairs. *Labor Law Journal.* April, 1955.

NLRB Control and Administration of Representation Elections. *Indiana Law Journal.* Winter, 1955.

The Question of Exempting Natural Gas Producers from Federal Control. *Congressional Digest.* June–July, 1955.

Roche, Redmond H., Jr., and Kurt L. Hanslowe. NLRB Absolutism—A Dogma Revisited. *Labor Law Journal.* May, 1955.

Sherman, Sidney. Recognition and Jurisdictional Strikes under Taft-Hartley. *Labor Law Journal.* April, 1955.

Shulman, Harry. Reason, Contract, and Law in Labor Relations. *Harvard Law Review.* April, 1955.

Somers, Gerald G. The Multiemployer Proposals and the Coal Operators. *Labor Law Journal.* May, 1955.

Stocking, George W., and Willard F. Mueller. The Cellophane Case and the New Competition. *American Economic Review.* March, 1955.

Sturm, Hobert P. Webb-Pomerene Associations. *Western Political Quarterly.* March, 1955.

Union Activity in Public Employment. *Columbia Law Review.* March, 1955.

Unterberger, S. Herbert. From Guaranteed Annual Wages to Income Security. *Labor Law Journal.* April, 1955.

———. How the New GAW Proposals Meet Employer Objections. *Labor Law Journal.* May, 1955.

Updegraff, Clarence M. Iowa Rules for Valuation of Public Utility Property in Relation to Rate Making. *Iowa Law Review.* Spring, 1955.

Williams, Charles M. Cumulative Voting. *Harvard Business Review.* May-June, 1955.

The Wolfson Case: Cumulative Voting and Staggered Elections. *Northwestern University Law Review.* March-April, 1955.

1954 Annual Survey of American Law. Part II—Government Regulation and Taxation. *New York University Law Review.* February, 1955.

Health, Education, and Welfare

Emery, Walter B., and Ralph Steetle. State Progress in Educational Television. *State Government.* March, 1955.

Greenfield, Margaret. State Aid to Local Communities in Establishing Mental Health Services. *State Government.* May, 1955.

Joskow, Jules. Organized Medicine and the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York. *Social Service Review.* March, 1955.

Larsen, Roy E. What's Being Done about the School Building Crisis? *State Government.* May, 1955.

State Action for Mental Health. *State Government.* April, 1955.

Weinberg, A. A. Retirement Funds for Public School Teachers. *State Government.* March, 1955.

Winter, William F. Mississippi's Legislative Approach to the School Segregation Problem. *Mississippi Law Journal.* March, 1955.

Workmen's Compensation in Ohio. Ohio Legislative Service Commission. 1955.

Military Affairs and National Security

DeNovo, John A. Petroleum and the United States Navy before World War I. *Mississippi Valley Historical Review.* March, 1955.

May, Ernest R. The Development of Political-Military Consultation in the United States. *Political Science Quarterly.* June, 1955.

The President's New Military Reserve Plan. [Symposium.] *Congressional Digest.* April, 1955.

Ridgway, James M. The Schools and Civil Defense Evacuation. *American School Board Journal.* April, 1955.

Rutland, Robert A. The Army Seeks a "Good" Press. *Journalism Quarterly.* Spring, 1955.

Secrecy, Security, and Loyalty. [Symposium.] *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists.* April, 1955.

Strausz-Hupé, Robert, and Stefan T. Possony, eds. Air Power and National Security. [Symposium.] *The Annals.* May, 1955.

Tietz, J. B. Jehovah's Witnesses: Conscientious Objectors. *Southern California Law Review.* February, 1955.

Government Documents

Congress

House. Committee on Agriculture. Mexican Farm Labor Program. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

——— ———. Study of the Dairy Industry. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. Committee on Armed Services. Disposal of Government-Owned Synthetic Rubber Producing Facilities. Hearings. Committee Print No. 10. Also House Report No. 227. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

——— ———. National Reserve Plan. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. Committee on Banking and Currency. Control and Regulation of Bank Holding Companies. Hearings. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. Committee on Education and Labor. Federal Aid to States for School Construction. Hearings. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. Committee on Government Operations. Utilization of Surplus Property for Educational and Public Health Purposes. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Hawaii-Alaska Statehood. Hearings. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Mental Health Study Act of 1955. Hearings before Subcommittee. Also House Report No. 241. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

——— ———. Permanent Certificates for Local Service Air Carriers. Hearings. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

——— ———. State Taxation of Interstate Trucking and the Reciprocity Problem. Staff Report. Committee Print. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Study of the Operations of the Maritime Administration and the Federal Maritime Board. Hearings. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Federal Salaries and Classifications. Hearings. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

——— ———. The General Accounting Office's Report on Financial Management of the Post Office Department. House Report No. 435. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

——— ———. Postal Pay and Classification. Hearings. Also House Report No. 224. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. Committee on Public Works. Restatement of Highway Laws. Hearings before

Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Extension of Direct Loan Program. Hearing before Subcommittee on Housing. Also House Report No. 447. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

——— ———. Pensions and Other Benefits for Veterans and Their Dependents of Service in and after the Spanish War. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. Committee on Ways and Means. Customs Simplification Act of 1955. Hearings. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. Needs of the Highway Systems, 1955–84. House Doc. No. 120. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. Progress and Feasibility of Toll Roads and Their Relation to the Federal-Aid Program. House Doc. No. 139. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. Public Utility Relocation Incident to Highway Improvement. House Doc. No. 127. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

House and Senate. Committees on Agriculture. Tobacco. Hearings before Subcommittees. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

Senate. Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Allocation of REA Funds. Hearing before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

——— ———. Disposal of Agricultural Surpluses—Cotton. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. Committee on Appropriations. Inventory Report on Federal Real Property in the United States. Senate Doc. No. 32. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. Committee on Armed Services. Career Incentive Act of 1955. Hearings. Also Senate Report No. 125. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

——— ———. Civil Defense Program. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. Committee on Banking and Currency. Election of National Bank Directors. Hearing before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

——— ———. Extension of Small Business Administration. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

——— ———. Housing Act of 1955. Hearings before Subcommittee. Also Senate Report No. 404. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

——— ———. Rubber Facilities Disposal. Hearings before Subcommittee. Also Senate Report No. 117. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

——— ———. Stock Market Study. Hearings. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. Committee on District of Columbia. District of Columbia Charter Act. Hearings. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

——. Committee on Finance. Trade Agreements Extension. Hearings. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. Committee on Government Operations. Army Personnel Actions Relating to Irving Peress. Hearings before Subcommittee on Investigations. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

——— ———. Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage. Report of Subcommittee on Investigations. Senate Report No. 230. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Colorado River Storage Project. Hearing before Subcommittee. Also Senate Report No. 128. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

——— ———. Hells Canyon Project, Idaho-Oregon. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Permanent Certificates for Local Service Air Carriers. Hearings before Subcommittee. Also Senate Report No. 124. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. Committee on the Judiciary. Appointment of Representatives. Senate Report No. 229. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

——— ———. Nomination and Election of President and Vice President. Hearings before Subcommittee. 8th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

——— ———. Strategy and Tactics of World Communism: The Significance of the Matusow Case. Hearing before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Amending the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. Hearings before Subcommittee. Also Senate Report No. 498. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. Committee on Public Works. National Highway Program. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. Committee on Rules and Administration. Federal Elections Act of 1955. Hearings before Subcommittee. Also Senate Report No. 624. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

———. The Railroad Passenger Deficit Problem. 1954 Report of Special Committee on Cooperation with the ICC. . . . Senate Doc. No. 24. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1955.

Other Federal

Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. Business Enterprises. Report to Congress. May, 1955.

———. Federal Medical Services. Report to Congress. Also Task Force Report. February, 1955.

———. Food and Clothing in the Government. Report to Congress. Also Task Force Report. April, 1955.

———. Legal Services and Procedure. Report to Congress. Also Task Force Report. March, 1955.

———. Lending, Guaranteeing, and Insurance Activities. Report to Congress. March, 1955. Also Task Force Report. February, 1955.

———. Transportation. Subcommittee Report. March, 1955.

———. Use and Disposal of Federal Surplus Property. Report to Congress. April, 1955. Also Task Force Report. February, 1955.

Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. Governments Division. Historical Statistics on State and Local Government Finances, 1902–1953. 1955.

General Services Administration. The National Archives. Preliminary Inventory of the Records of the National War Labor Board (World War II). Compiled by Estelle Rebec. 1955.

——— ———. Preliminary Inventory of the Records of the War Relocation Authority. Compiled by Estelle Rebec and Martin Rogin. 1955.

FOREIGN AND COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT

La Nueva Constitución de Puerto Rico: Informes a la Convención Constituyente preparados por la Escuela de Administración Pública de la Facultad de Ciencias Sociales. (Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico: University of Puerto Rico, School of Public Administration. 1954. Pp. xix, 609.)

In 1950 Congress enacted a law authorizing Puerto Rico to draft its own constitution and thus achieve "commonwealth" status within the American Union. This proposal was eagerly accepted by the Puerto Rican people in a referendum held a few months later, and delegates were elected to a constitutional convention. The convention met in August of 1951 and completed the draft of Puerto Rico's present constitution after nearly five months of steady work.

The members of the faculty of the University of Puerto Rico's School of Public Administration were fully aware of the preliminary steps usually taken in a progressive state of the American Union before the opening session of a constitutional convention—the collection of other constitutions and similar documents for comparaative purposes, and the analysis of problems likely to require the attention of the delegates. Such preliminary steps were especially necessary in the case of Puerto Rico, because of the unusual complexity of the task that confronted the delegates. They had to face a whole series of new problems, including the nature and even the name of this "Associated Free State."

So the School of Public Administration put its staff to work preparing the necessary background material. Assistance was provided by other members of the faculty of the University of Puerto Rico, and even by some experts from the United States. All the investigators worked as a group; the reports prepared by individuals or small sections were subsequently discussed and revised by the group before presentation to the constitutional convention. Many of the group's recommendations were accepted by the convention, which subsequently expressed its formal thanks to the School of Public Administration for a job well done.

The thanks were fully deserved. The reports covered the widest possible range of subjects—the relations of Puerto Rico with Spain, and subsequently with the United States from 1898 to 1951; the bill of rights; the thorny problem of amendment; and, in great detail, the proposed organization of the new government. The authors proved their thorough familiarity with jurisprudence in the United States and with the literature of American political science. They drew extensively on European experience, also. In fact, they could scarcely have done a better job.

It is extremely fortunate, therefore, that the results of their investigations have now been made available in book form. The book, published in 1954 under the title *La Nueva Constitución de Puerto Rico*, runs to more than six hundred pages. It has an introduction by Professor Carl Friedrich of Harvard, who was one of the visiting investigators. There are extensive footnotes, bibliographies, appendices—in fact, all the trappings as well as the substance of scholarship.—AUSTIN F. MACDONALD, *University of California.*

Germany Reports. (German Federal Government: Press and Information Office. 1953. Pp. 367. $3.00.)

Germany traditionally was well supplied with official and unofficial yearbooks, handbooks, and manuals containing detailed information on governmental institutions. These were casualties of the Second World War and of the troubled years which immediately followed. The remarkable revival of West Germany since 1948 has been paralleled by a reappearance of this type of literature. Among the various private undertakings, one may cite the excellent *Deutschland Jahrbuch,* edited by Klaus Mehnert and Heinrich Schulte (1st ed., 1949; 2nd ed., 1953). The West German cities and states have resumed their official manuals and directories. Since its inception in 1949, the Federal Republic has produced official publications of all sorts. For example, the *Handbuch für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland,* the successor to the *Handbuch für das Deutsche Reich,* was published in 1953 by the Federal Ministry of the Interior. In the following year, the Press Office of the German Diplomatic Mission in Washington prepared the attractive *Handbook of German Affairs.*

Germany Reports is the English edition of a somewhat longer work (416 pages), *Deutschland Heute,* issued in 1953 by the Federal Press and Information Office in Bonn. It covers political, economic, social, cultural, and religious developments from May, 1945 through part of 1953. Numerous statistical tables, graphs, maps, and pictures are included. While the main emphasis is on West Germany, there is also much information on Berlin and East Germany.

Although *Germany Reports* is intended to present the official German interpretation of events, it is carefully done. There are a few mistakes, some in English spelling or translation and others of a substantive character. Thus in the German edition (p. 65), it is correctly stated that the first elections in the U. S. Zone were for the *Gemeinde* councils. In *Germany Reports* (p. 44), it is said that county (*Kreis*) elections came first. However, these minor errors do not detract appreciably from the usefulness of the volume to the American political scientist and the general reader.—ROGER H. WELLS, *Bryn Mawr College.*

Die Deutschen Parteien seit 1945. BY OSSIP K. FLECHTHEIM. (Berlin: Carl Heymanns Verlag. 1955. Pp. ix, 158.)

German scholarship has long neglected the "political science" approach to the study of political parties as distinguished from the study of their origin, history, and ideology. The present source-book closes an important gap in this connection. It contains carefully selected, ably introduced material on such matters as party organization and party statutes, programs, financial resources, composition of membership and leadership as to social origin, age, and sex, representation in parliaments, and relationship between party at large and parliamentary "fractions"; there is interesting and generally up-to-date statistical material, and also information, sometimes difficult to come by, on the less well-known smaller parties of West Germany, such as BHE (the party of refugees and expellees) and DP (German party).

Most of the material here presented is scattered in publications not easily accessible in this country; the volume might, therefore, prove of value to those in the United States who wish to study German affairs closely. It would be a welcome source for reference in teaching comparative government if it could be made available in English.—JOHN H. HERZ, *The City College.*

The French Labor Movement. BY VAL R. LORWIN. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1954. Pp. xix, 346. $6.00.)

An able study of the French trade union movement, the first two parts of which deal with the historical background of the trade union "movements" from 1789 to 1953. This development has been marked by elements both of continuity and of discontinuity, the liberation of France in 1944 illustrating the last of the "apparent discontinuities." Part III "describes and discusses the structure and functioning of the unions, their relative strength and influence, their collective bargaining relationships, their role within the shop, and their relationships to the political parties." One may agree with Professor Donald C. McKay in the "Foreword" that this is a "wide-ranging and perceptive treatment" and that "No one who has a serious interest in the ills which have beset France in these recent years of crisis and who would find his way through the travail of this gifted but harassed people can afford not to read and ponder this book's findings."—R.T.C.

Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State. BY MAURICE DUVERGER. TRANSLATED BY BARBARA AND

ROBERT NORTH. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1954. Pp. xxxvii, 439.)

The first English language edition of *Les Partis Politiques*, first published in Paris in 1951, and reviewed in this REVIEW, Vol. 46, pp. 563–64 (June, 1952). This translated edition incorporates revisions subsequently made by the author and includes a brief foreword by D. W. Brogan.

Les Techniques du Travail Gouvernemental dans L'État Moderne: Étude de Science Politique et Administrative et de Droit Constitutionnel Comparé. BY ANDRÉ BERTRAND. (Bruxelles: Institut International des Sciences Administratives. 1954. Pp. 89.)

Study no. XX in the series being prepared by the International Institute of Administrative Sciences. Professor Bertrand was Chief of the Legislative Service of the General Secretariat of the Government of France and is the Director of Studies of the National School of Administration. The discussion is confined to the United States, Great Britain, and France.

The Political Novel. BY JOSEPH L. BLOTNER. (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1955. Pp. xi, 100. $.95.)

A very brief introduction to a long list of American, some English and a few Italian, French, German, Russian, and South African political novels, grouped and analyzed under five types or categories: those serving as political instruments, as political history, as mirrors of national character, and as analyses of group, or of individual political behavior.

Members of Parliament, 1734–1832. BY GERRIT P. JUDD, IV. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1955. Pp. viii, 389. $6.00.)

Mr. Judd's monograph makes a unique contribution from two standpoints: (1) it comprises a detailed and absorbing analysis of the members of the British House of Commons from Walpole to the Reform Bill; and (2) the analysis has been based upon the tabulation of data by punch card and sorting machine.

The descriptions of the background, education, family, wealth, tenure, and other characteristics of some 5000 M.P.'s will likely be the definitive statement on the nature and quality of parliamentary personnel during this critical period. The author has assembled (and documented) a tremendous quantity of biographical materials and, by arranging them for machine tabulation, has explored them in detail. The study is especially valuable for its correlation of and cross-references to the many and diverse circumstances of the members. His conclusions are thus amply supported by statistical evidence and do not always jibe with the long-accepted stereotypes of the unreformed House of Commons. Finally, in a lengthy appendix he has given brief biographical details on each of the 5000 members, together with references to further source materials.

This is a pioneering effort deserving of much praise. Although the punch card no doubt has serious limitations as a tool of historical research, this able monograph shows clearly that these limits have by no means been reached.—W.S.L.

A Guide to Parliamentary Papers: What They Are: How to Find Them: How to Use Them. BY P. FORD AND G. FORD. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1955. Pp. xiii, 79. 7/6.)

This most useful guide has been prepared "to assist students, researchers and those interested in public affairs who want to consult or read Parliamentary Papers." The authors have edited three volumes of lists of Parliamentary Papers, and write from a detailed knowledge of the intricacies of these important materials. They stress the Papers themselves rather than the procedures in Parliament, and present briefly information as to the various collections, the indexes, how to use the Papers as well as how to cite them, and even give a note on the Debates as well as suggestions as to the arrangement of collections of the individual Papers.—J.B.C.

The Foreign Office. BY LORD STRANG, G. C. B., G. C. M. G., LATELY PERMANENT UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS, AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE. (London: G. Allen & Unwin; New York; Oxford University Press. 1955. New Whitehall series [2]. Pp. 226. 15s.)

The work, although not subjected to the stamp of official conformity, is basically a work about the British Foreign Service by the Foreign Service, having as appendices the Foreign Office departmental structure and departmental allocation of work, as of October, 1954.—J.B.C.

Le Régime Politique Britannique. BY ANDRÉ

MATHIOT. (Paris: Librairie Armand Colin. 1955. Pp. 335.)

A general description of the British political system, in which the author's primary interest is in the means by which that system reconciles the needs of effective governmental power with the preservation of popular liberties. This is a new issue by the *Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques* and is offered as the first of a series of the political institutions of the great countries of the world.

Bibliografie van in Nederland verschenen officiële en semi-officiële uitgaven. XXV. 1953. By the Koninklijke Bibliotheek. ('s-Gravenhage: Staatsdrukkerij. 1954. Pp. 228. F. 3.50.)

The new volume of the annual list of Netherlands official publications now departs from the long-established title *Nederlandse overheidsuitgaven,* taking into account the steady increase in publications issued by semi-official institutions, especially in the field of scientific reports. The work is an indispensable tool for anyone wishing to keep abreast of the activities of the government in the Netherlands, and might well serve as a model for similar work in many another foreign country.—J.B.C.

De ondergrondse pers, 1940–1945. BY L. E. WINKEL. ('s-Gravenhage: M. Nijhoff, 1954. Rijksinstituut voor Oorlogsdocumentatie, nr. 6. Pp. 414.)

The Netherlands Institute for War Documentation even in 1943 began the collecting of the Dutch underground press, and eventually secured about 50,000 copies representing some 1,200 papers. The present work by Miss Lydia E. Winkel gives a brief history and catalog of these papers, which meant so much to the Dutch people in arousing the spirit of resistance to the German occupation. Information about each paper has been verified so far as possible by actual participants, cooperation in this having been refused only by the Netherlands Communist party. At the end, there is a 14-page English summary for the benefit of those not reading Dutch readily.—J.B.C.

Die Abgabe amtlicher Drucksachen an die öffentlichen Bibliotheken. Das Pflichtexemplarrecht für amtliche Drucksachen in Deutschland von seinen Anfängen bis zum gegenwärtigen Stand. Zugleich Grundlagen für eine Neuregelung. BY HEINRICH KASPERS. (Köln: Greven Verlag, 1954. Pp. 167. Arbeiten aus dem Bibliothekar-Lehrinstitut des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen, Heft 4.)

The survey of provisions for the distribution of the official publications of both national and state governments in Germany to libraries is intended as a basis for systematic regulation of the matter. Both the Federal Republic and the Democratic Republic are included in the survey. There had never been a systematic provision for the depository distribution to libraries of all the official publications of the national government such as has long existed in the United States. The monthly catalog of German official publications which had been prepared by the Deutsche Bücherei, Leipzig, 1928–1944, is a publication which should be resumed again, if only for the Federal Republic. The survey should serve as a stimulus for a better over-all treatment of the matter of official publications.—J.B.C.

Amtliches Gemeindeverzeichnis für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland, 1953. (Bevölkerungs- und Gebietsstand, 31.12.1953.) BY STATISTISCHES BUNDESAMT, WIESBADEN, (Stuttgart, Köln: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1954. Pp. viii, 420, map. Statistik für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Band 108. DM 15.)

The official list of cities and towns in the German Federal Republic gives the population and area by local government districts and also by special types of districts for the federal government (courts, finance, customs, etc.) with the principal section being a systematic list of cities by state. There is a special table for changes in name and boundary. A map of administrative boundaries is included at the end. An earlier edition had been published in August, 1952, as vol. 33 of the *Statistik der Bundesrepublik Deutschland.*—J.B.C.

Personal der öffentlichen Verwaltung am 2.10. 1952. BY STATISTISCHES BUNDESAMT. (Stuttgart, Köln; W. Kohlhammer Verlag. 1954. Statistik der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Band 84. Pp. 38. DM 2.)

The statistics of public officials in the German Federal Republic includes not only the Federal government but also those of the *Länder* and of the municipalities, and deals also with the types of service, taking up such points as the utilization of women, of refugees, and the *Schwerbeschädigte* in the public service. A previous edition was issued as of February 9, 1950—J.B.C.

Der zweite Deutsche Bundestag; sein Vorgeschichte, sein Aufbau, und sein Werden. By Hans Trossmann. (Bonn; Verlag Bonner Universitäts-Buchdruckerei Gebr. Scheur G.m.b.H. 1954. Pp. xiii, 384.)

This manual about the second German Bundestag, prepared by the *Direktor beim Deutschen Bundestag,* begins with a brief review of German political institutions, 1945–1953, and includes the text of the Federal Constitution, a statement about the election law, the membership of committees, an alphabetical biographical directory of the 487 members of the Bundestag, statistical tables of the elections by district for both 1949 and 1953, and the rules for both the Bundestag and the Bundesrat.—J.B.C.

Las Constituciones del Perú. (Exposición, crítica y textos.) By José Pareja Paz-Soldan. (Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispánica. 1954. Las Constituciones hispano-americanas, 6. Pp. 1075. Ptas. 150).

A collection of the texts of all the constitutions of Peru and related constitutional acts, preceded by a considerable study of these by a competent authority, who is a professor at the Universidad Católica del Perú. The series, edited by Manuel Fraga Iribarni, has included similar works for Ecuador, Cuba, Argentina, Puerto Rico, and Panama.—J.B.C.

Egypt's Liberation: The Philosophy of the Revolution. By Premier Gamal Abdul Nasser. (Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press. 1955. Pp. 119. $2.00.)

A description by Egypt's chief of state of the motives and aspirations (as well as the disappointments) of the revolutionaries.

Diritto Costituzionale. By Paolo Biscaretti di Ruffìa. (Napoli: Casa Editrice Dott. Eugenio Jovene. 3rd ed. 1954. Pp. xxiv, 611.)

The third edition of a standard Italian text in constitutional law; the first edition appeared in 1946, the second in 1949–50. This edition is marked by a heavier emphasis upon the constitutional law and political institutions of Italy. It is a heavily documented book, evidencing the typical emphasis of Italian texts upon the formal aspects of constitutional development. The author makes considerable use of writings by American authors on American government and constitutional law.

La France au XX^e Siecle. By Robert Lacour-Gayet. (New York: The Dryden Press. 1954. Pp. x, 329. $3.25.)

The author, a professor at St. John's University and Lecturer on French Civilization at New York University, has served as Financial Attaché to the French Embassy in Washington. He seeks to furnish a general survey and picture of French life, "political and economic, artistic and literary, philosophical."

Vichy: Political Dilemma. By Paul Farmer. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1955. Pp. 376. $5.50.)

The author presents a sober analysis of the behavior of the Vichy men, their motives, and the results which they obtained, both good and bad. His general finding is stated in the prologue: "Not only would it be presumptuous to divide the men of Vichy into patriots and traitors—it would be fatuous. For most of these men were neither heroes nor villians. Like their adversaries, they were, rather, men who acted from a mixture of high and low motives, in search of both public and private interest" (p. 4).

The Fate of the French Non-Communist Left. By E. Drexel Godfrey, Jr. (Garden City: Doubleday & Co. Inc. 1955. Pp. ix, 75. $.95.)

This short study attempts to explain and assess the reasons behind the "anemia of the only forces that could counter the strident postwar power of the French Communists."

The French Constitution and the Social Question in the Old Regime, 1700–1789. By Lester B. Mason. (Bonn: Heinrich Trapp. 1954. Pp. 117.)

An analysis of the concepts and ideas of prominent 18th century French political philosophers and others on the nature of the French Constitution under the Old Regime.

Soviet Power and Policy. By George B. De Huszar and Associates. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company. 1955. Pp. x, 598. $6.50.)

Fourteen co-authors bring together a wealth of useful data pertinent to the book's topic. The main part of the volume deals with various ingredients of Soviet power, ranging from geographical and demographical factors to the armed forces and the police apparatus. Having thus analyzed Soviet strengths and weaknesses, the authors described the Soviet expansion in Eurasia. Each chapter is accompanied by a selected bibliography.

The Origin of the Communist Autocracy: Political Opposition in the Soviet State. First Phase: 1917–1922. By LEONARD SCHAPIRO. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1955. Pp. xv. 397. $7.00.)

The Russian Revolution, 1917: A Personal Record by N. N. Sukhanov. EDITED, ABRIDGED, AND TRANSLATED BY JOEL CARMICHAEL. (London, New York and Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1955. Pp. xxxvii, 691. $10.00.)

Both of these books deal with the Russian revolution of 1917 and its immediate aftermath. Mr. Schapiro concerns himself primarily with the groups which opposed Lenin, both within and without the Bolshevik party, and his book is an historical study based on a wealth of documentary materials, mostly Russian. Mr. Sukhanov's book is the report of an eyewitness and participant. The author, who joined the Bolshevik party in 1917 but soon began to oppose Lenin (who used to call him a "Quarter Bolshevik"), registered his reminiscenses of the events in a seven-volume *Notes on the Revolution*, published in Russian in 1923. The present volume is a sharply abridged translation of the original work.

Nine Soviet Portraits. By RAYMOND A. BAUER WITH ASSISTANCE OF EDWARD WASIOLEK. (Boston: Massachusetts Institute of Technology; New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1955. Pp. viii, 187. $3.95.)

Using materials gathered from interviews with Soviet refugees, the author gives a "set of synthetic portraits of typical Soviet types" from different walks of life (e.g., students, a a woman collective farmer, a factory director).

Institutional Changes in the Postwar Economy of Poland. By W. J. STANKIEWICZ AND J. M. MONTIAS. (New York: Mid-European Studies Center, Free Europe Committee, Inc. 1955. Pp. 125.)

One of the Free Europe Committee's publications on Moscow's European satellites. Basing their study on primary Polish materials, the authors trace the gradual adaptation of the Polish economy to the Soviet model.

The Men Who Ruled India: The Guardians. By PHILIP WOODRUFF. (New York: St. Martin's Press. 1954. Pp. 385. $5.00.)

The second volume of a study of British rule in India by a distinguished British civil servant who served in India from 1928 to 1947. Covering the period from 1858 to 1947, this book is an illuminating and scholarly account of the many civil wars from which both Britain and India emerged with greater respect for each other.

Democratic Government in India. By N. SRINIVASAN. (Calcutta: The World Press, Ltd. 1954. Pp. 404. Rs. 10/-.)

A comprehensive textbook on the government of India giving considerable attention to the political heritage of Hindu and Muslim India and to British control of India. The excellent analysis of the Constitution of India is accompanied by comparisons with the constitutions of other nations.

SELECTED ARTICLES AND DOCUMENTS ON
FOREIGN AND COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT

WILLIAM H. ROBERTS
Catholic University of America

General

Fisher, H. H. The Communist Revolution. An Outline of Strategy and Tactics. Stanford, Hoover Institute Studies, Series A, No. 2, March, 1955.

Martínez, A. C. La Médula del Sistema de Poder en el Estado Contemporáneo: La Burocracia. *Revista de Estudios Políticos.* September–October, 1954.

Pound, R. Comparative Law in Space and Time. *American Journal of Comparative Law.* Winter, 1955.

Ripert, G. La Technique Législative de de l'Économie Dirigée. *Tulane Law Review.* February, 1955.

Tripathi, K. D. International Socialist Cooperation—1848–1954. *India Quarterly.* January–March, 1955.

Specific Areas

United Kingdom

Advisory Council on Scientific Policy. Seventh Annual Report, 1953–54. London, H.M.S.O., 1954 (Cmd. 9260).

Balogh, T. British Party Programs. *Foreign Affairs.* April, 1955.

Baratier, P. Grand Bretagne: Droit Syndical; Recours Judiciaire contre une Décision d'Expulsion. *Revue du Droit Publique et de la Science Politique.* October–December, 1954.

Conservative Party. Great Britain. Research Department. The Nation's Economic Progress. London, Conservative and Unionist Central Office, 1955.

——— Research Department. Our Defense Policy. London, Conservative and Unionist Central Office, 1955.

Dashfield, D.C. Her Majesty's Stationery Office. *Parliamentary Affairs.* Spring, 1955.

Denning, Lord Justice. Law in a Developing Community. *Public Administration.* Spring, 1955.

The Economic Issues. *Economist.* April 30, 1955.

Great Britain. British Information Services. Reference Division. Bibliography of Publications on the British Conservative Party. New York, 1955.

——— British Information Services. Reference Division. Bibliography of Publications on the British Labor Party. New York, 1955.

——— British Information Services. Reference Division. Bibliography of Publications on the British Liberal Party. New York, 1955.

——— British Information Services. Reference Division. Britain's Economic Position: Facts and Figures from the White Paper: "Economic Survey 1955." London, 1955.

——— Central Office of Information. Reference Division. Government Employment and Training Services. London, 1954.

——— Central Office of Information. Reference Division. Social Services in Britain. London, 1954.

Griffith, J.A.G. Atomic Energy Authority Act, 1954. *Modern Law Review.* November, 1954.

Hacker, A. Why Nationalize?—British Labour's Unasked Question. *Social Research.* Spring, 1955.

Hampden, F. C. The Organisation of the Ministry of Transport and Civil Aviation. *Public Administration.* Spring, 1955.

Harris, J. S. Central Government Inspection of Local Services in Britain. *Public Administration Review.* Winter, 1955.

Keyes, L. S. Some Controversial Aspects of the Public Corporation. *Political Science Quarterly.* March, 1955.

Leitch, W. A. Statutes—United Kingdom, 1954. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly.* April, 1955.

A Normal British Crisis. *Fortune.* May, 1955.

Please, S. Government Control of the Capital Expenditure of the Nationalised Industries. *Public Administration.* Spring, 1955.

Scott, J. A. The Tripartite Health Service. *Public Administration.* Spring, 1955.

Strength of the British Economy: Expansion and Precaution. *Labor and Industry in Britain.* March, 1955.

Taylor, H. C. Food and Farm Land in Britain. *Land Economics.* February, 1955.

Trade Union Congress. ABC of the TUC. London, 1954.

Zur Verwaltungsreform in England. *Öffentliche Verwaltung.* December 24, 1954.

Willson, F. M. G. Ministries and Boards: Some Aspects of Administrative Development since 1832. *Public Administration.* Spring, 1955.

Colonial Areas

Adam, T. R. Modern Colonialism: Institutions and Policies. Garden City, Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1955.

The Civil Service in Nigeria. *Colonial Review.* September, 1954.

Great Britain. Central Office of Information. Reference Division. Education in the United Kingdom Dependencies. London, 1955.

——— Central Office of Information. Reference Division. Political Progress in the United Kingdom Dependencies. London, 1955.

——— Colonial Office. Report on British Honduras for the Year 1953. London, H.M.S.O., 1955.

——— Colonial Office. Introducing the Colonies. London, 1955.

Harlow, V. Colonies and Democracy. *Parliamentary Affairs.* Spring, 1955.

Krug, W. G. Das Experiment Goldküste. *Aussenpolitik.* March, 1955.

Luke, H. Paradox in the Pacific. *New Commonwealth.* January 10, 1955.

A Nascent Dominion. African Self-Government in the Gold Coast. *Round Table.* March, 1955.

Parmer, J. N. Trade Unions and Politics in Malaya. *Far Eastern Survey.* March, 1955.

Rennie, G. The First Year of Federation. *African Affairs.* January, 1955.

Commonwealth of Nations

Australia: Conflict in the Labour Party. *Round Table.* March, 1955.

Bleiber, F. Kaschmir. *Archiv des Völkerrechts.* March, 1955.

Carrington, C. E. A New Theory of the Commonwealth. *International Affairs.* April, 1955.

Chambers, N. Civil Liberties after the Samur Case. *University of Toronto School of Law Review.* Spring, 1954.

Le Christianisme dans l'Inde Moderne. *Actualité Religieuse dans le Monde.* October, 1954.

Cowan, Z. A Comparison of the Constitutions of Australia and the United States. *Buffalo Law Review.* Winter, 1955.

Crane, R. I. Urbanism in India. *American Journal of Sociology.* March, 1955.

Driedger, E. A. The Legislative Process in Canada. *American Bar Association Journal.* February, 1955.

Embee. The Defence Forces of Pakistan. *Pakistan Review.* October, 1953.

Etienne, G. Problèmes Économiques et Démographiques de l'Inde. *Politique Étrangère.* January–February, 1955.

L'Évolution Constitutionnelle de Ceylan. *Notes et Études Documentaires.* October 18, 1954.

Harper, N. D. Race Relations and the Commonwealth of Nations. *Australian Outlook.* December, 1954.

Hasan K. S. The Strategic Interests of Pakistan. Karachi, Pakistan Institute of International Affairs, 1954.

Hessler, W. H. Canada: Our Closest Ally. *United States Naval Institute Proceedings.* March, 1955.

Hopkins, E. R. Saving Parliament's Time. *Queen's Quarterly.* Winter, 1955.

Karim, M. I. Pakistan Army. *Marine Corps Gazette.* April, 1955.

Kelson, R. N. The New Zealand National Party. *Political Science.* September, 1954.

Kittrell, E. R. Indian Economists and Economic Development. *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly.* March, 1955.

Laskin, B. Our Civil Liberties. *Queen's Quarterly.* Winter, 1955.

Leckie, R. Canada's Air Force—A New Look. *Canadian Geographical Journal.* September, 1954.

Leyser, J. Die Australische Gesetzgebung auf dem Gebiete des Privatrechts, 1939–1953. *Zeitschrift fur Ausländisches und Internationales Privatrecht.* December, 1954.

Living Standards in Pakistan: A Group Study. Karachi, Pakistan Institute of International Affairs, 1954.

Parthasarathy, R. Unemployment in India. *India Quarterly.* January–March, 1955.

Rural Development Schemes in India. New York, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1954.

Sastri, J. V. S. R. Managerial Implications of Nationalization in India and Great Britain. *India Quarterly.* January–March, 1955.

Das Südafrikanische Bürgerrecht. *Standesamt.* December 10, 1954.

Toombs, M. P. Provincial Aid and Local Responsibility in Education. *Canadian Education.* March, 1955.

Pakistan: Setting the New Course. *Round Table.* March, 1955.

Scarrow, H. A. Promotion Procedures in the Australian Federal Public Service. *Personnel Administration.* March, 1955.

South Africa: Mr. Strijdom Takes Over. *Round Table.* March, 1955.

Swaminathan, V. S. Scientific and Industrial Research in India. *American Scientist.* October, 1954.

Shanahan, F. Some Reflections on Cabinet Government in New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Public Administration.* September, 1954.

Spencer, D. L. Mixed Enterprise as a Tool of Economic Development: India's Contribution. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology.* January, 1955.

Tyson, G. Foreign Investment in India. *International Affairs.* April, 1955.

Williamson, R. C. Race Relations in South Africa. *Sociology and Social Research.* January–February, 1955.

Western Europe

Alison, B. The Enigma of France: Political Instability in an Orderly Country. *British Survey.* March, 1955.

Angeloni, R. Il Fondamento dell' Indipendenza del Pubblico Ministero. *Politica Parlamentare.* September–October, 1954.

Aron, R. Réflexions sur la Politique et la Science Politique Française. *Revue Française de Science Politique.* January-March, 1955.

Barth, H. Franco und die Bourbonen. *Aussenpolitik.* February, 1955.

Bonnaud-Delamare, R. Observations sur les Décrets de Déconcentration. *Revue du Droit Public et de la Science Politique.* October–December, 1954.

Charles-Roux, F. Colonisation Française et Institutions, Coutumes, Traditions, Civilisations Indigènes. *Nouvelle Revue Française d'Outre-Mer.* October, 1954.

Czapski, G. Gesetzgebung der Niederlande auf dem Gebiete des Privatrechts, 1940–1953. *Zeitschrift für Ausländisches und Internationales Privatrecht.* December, 1954.

Daalder, H. Parties and Politics in the Netherlands. *Political Studies.* February, 1955.

d'Alauro, O. Aktuelle Probleme der Wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung in Italien. *Europa Archiv.* April 5, 1955.

Debré, M. Trois Caractéristiques du Système Parlementaire Français. *Revue Française de Science Politique.* January–March, 1955.

Der Demokratische Sozialismus in Europa. A Symposium. *Dokumente.* April, 1955.

Fackler, M. Die Italienischen Parteien. *Politische Studien.* March, 1955.

Feyzioglu, T. The Reforms of the French Higher Civil Service (I). *Public Administration.* Spring, 1955.

Les Finances Publiques de l'Italie. *Notes et Études Documentaires.* January 11, 1955.

French Communism: Two Portraits. *Problems of Communism.* March–April, 1955.

Fusilier, G. La Répresentation Proportionnelle en Suède de 1909 à 1952. *Revue Internationale d'Histoire Politique et Constitutionnelle.* July–September, 1954.

Goosens, C. La Communauté Européenne du Charbon et de l'Acier et le Régime Constitutionnel de la Belgique. *Revue du Droit Public et de la Science Politique.* January-March, 1955.

La Grande Crise du Syndicalisme Français. *Réalités.* February, 1955.

Healey, D. Socialism in Europe. *Progressive.* March, 1955.

Hessler, W. H. Sweden's Armed Neutrality. *United States Naval Institute Proceedings.* January, 1955.

Hirt, F. Du Droit de la Force Publique. *Revue du Droit Public et de la Science Politique.* October–December, 1954.

Hogan, D. Dail Eireann. *Parliamentary Affairs.* Spring, 1955.

Husmark, E. Occupational Health Services in Sweden. *World Medical Journal.* January, 1955.

LaPalombara, J. The Political Role of Organized Labor in Western Europe. *Journal of Politics.* February, 1955.

McLellan, D. S. The North African in France; a French Racial Problem. *Yale Review.* March, 1955.

Niboyet, J. P. La Question d'un Nouveau Code Civil en France. *Tulane Law Review.* February, 1955.

Mankiewicz, R. H. The Right to Strike of Civil Servants and Employees in the Public Services under the French Constitution of 1946. *American Journal of Comparative Law.* Winter, 1955.

Montini, L. The Parliamentary Inquiry into Destitution in Italy. *International Labour Review.* January, 1955.

Nolting, O. F. European Cities: City Management Methods. *Public Management.* March, 1955.

Picles, D. Constitutional Revision in France. *Parliamentary Affairs.* Spring, 1955.

Pires de Lima, A. P. Study of the Efficiency of the Civil Service in Portugal. *Revue Internationale des Sciences Administratives.* No. 1, 1955.

Pryce, R. Parliamentary Government in Italy Today. *Parliamentary Affairs.* Spring, 1955.

La République Française et les Problèmes de l'Outre-Mer. *Politique Étrangère.* October, 1954.

Simonini, R. C., Jr. The Universities of Italy. *American Association of University Professors Bulletin.* Winter, 1954–1955.

Soloveytchik, G. Zwei Aspekte des Schwedischen Sozialismus. *Schweizer Monatshefte.* November, 1954.

Spain. *Atlantic Monthly.* April, 1955.

Spain in Transition. *Economist.* May 21, 1955.

Street, H. A. The Law Relating to Local Government. Dublin, Stationery Office, 1955.

La Structure de la Cité Belge. *Revue Politique* (Bruxelles). September 20, 1954.

Systems of Government in Portuguese Overseas Territories. *Colonial Review.* March, 1954.

Van Bergh, H. Die Kommunistische Partei Italiens. *Internationales Jahrbuch der Politik.* December, 1954.

Wautier, L. A. Belgique: La Participation des Enterprises Privées à l'Action Administrative en Belgique. *Revue du Droit Public et de la Science Politique.* October–December, 1954.

Wurmser, L. The Organisation of the Presidency of the Council in France. *Revue Internationale des Sciences Administratives.* No. 1, 1955.

Zosteweij, B. National Wage Policy: The Experience of the Netherlands. *International Labour Review.* February, 1955.

Central Europe

Allgemeines Osterreichisches Verwaltungsrecht. *Juristische Blätter.* October 16, 1954.

Die Dokumente vom 5. Juni 1945 und die

Politische Einheit Deutschlands. *Europa Archiv.* March 5, 1955.

Eisermann, G. Parlament, Parteien und Verbände. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie.* No. 2, 1953–1954.

Haas, D. Bundesgesetze über Organisation und Verfahren der Landesbehörden. *Archiv des Öffentlichen Rechts.* March, 1955.

La Jeunesse en Allemagne Orientale. *Articles et Documents.* September, 1954.

Loewenstein, K. The Bonn Constitution and the European Defense Community Treaties. *Yale Law Journal.* May, 1955.

Menzel, W. Möglichkeiten und Grenzen des Verfassungsschutzes. *Politische Studien.* March, 1955.

Paget, R. What Sort of an Army Will Germany Have? *Twentieth Century.* January, 1955.

Petry, R. Die SPD und der Sozialismus. *Frankfurter Hefte.* September, 1954.

Prittie, T. The Federal German Parliament. *Parliamentary Affairs.* Spring, 1955.

Probleme der Wiederherstellung einer Deutschen Staatsgewalt. *Europa Archiv.* May 5, 1955.

Schütz, W. W. Äussere und Innere Verteidigung Deutschlands. *Aussenpolitik.* March, 1955.

Stein, W. Die Entwicklung der Presse in der "DDR." *Politische Studien.* February, 1955.

Soviet Union and Eastern Europe

Accounts of Soviet Use of Atomic Energy' *Current Digest of the Soviet Press.* April 27, 1955.

Apremont, B. Les Récents Développements de la Politique Agricole de l'U.R.S.S. *Politique Étrangère.* January–February, 1955.

Achminow, H. Ursachen der Korruption im Sowjetsystem. *Osteuropa.* April, 1955.

Berlitzer, H. Ungarn-Innenpolitik-Kampf gegen Bürokratie und Manager. *Osteuropa.* February, 1955.

Cass, W. G. Agriculture in the Soviet Union—I. *World Crops.* May, 1955.

Crankshaw, E. Russia's Calamity. *Atlantic Monthly.* May, 1955.

Dolan, E. Post-War Poland and the Church. *American Slavic and East European Review.* February, 1955.

Elton, J. Some Aspects of the Soviet Legal System. *Soviet Studies.* April, 1955.

Frank, V. S. New Changes in the Soviet Leadership. *Bulletin of the Institute for the Study of the History and Culture of the USSR.* March, 1955.

Frankel, J. Communism and the National Question in Yugoslavia. *Journal of Central European Affairs.* April, 1955.

Gaev, A. Soviet Press Censorship. Munich, Institute for the Study of the History and Culture of the USSR, 1955.

Galai, N. Contemporary Soviet Military Literature. *Bulletin of the Institute for the Study of the History and Culture of the USSR.* January, 1955.

Gerskovič, L. The System of Producers' Councils in Yugoslavia. *International Labour Review.* January, 1955.

Glovinskii, E. A. The Soviet Budget for 1955. *Bulletin of the Institute for the Study of the History and Culture of the USSR.* March, 1955.

Great Britain. Foreign Office. Research Department. A Bibliography of Principal Works on the USSR. London, 1954.

Hammond, T. T. Jugoslav Elections: Democracy in Small Doses. *Political Science Quarterly.* March, 1955.

Hazard, J. N. The Future of Codification in the USSR. *Tulane Law Review.* February, 1955.

Hochheim, A. "Westliche Satrapie" Osteuropa. *Schweizer Monatshefte.* October, 1954.

Inside Russia. *Nation's Business.* March 1955.

Kardelj, E. The Practice of Socialist Democracy in Yugoslavia. New York, Yugoslav Information Center, 1955.

Krypton, C. Secret Religious Organizations in the USSR. *Russian Review.* April, 1955.

Léontin, L. La Concéption Soviétique du Patriotisme. *Revue de Défense Nationale.* March, 1955.

Malara, J. Poland since the Death of Stalin. *Problems of Communism.* March-April, 1955.

Meissner, B. Sowjetunion-Aussenpolitik-Auswärtiger Dienst der UdSSR. *Osteuropa.* February, 1955.

——— Sowjetmarschälle—die Macht im Hintergrund. *Osteuropa.* April, 1955.

——— Sowjetunion—Inneres—Führungswechsel. *Osteuropa.* April, 1955.

——— Die Kommunistiche Partei der Sowjetunion vor und nach dem Tode Stalins. Frankfurt/Main, Dokumente und Berichte des Europa Archivs No. 12, 1955.

Mosely, P. Can Moscow Match Us Industrially? *Harvard Business Review.* March-April, 1955.

——— How "New" is the Kremlin's New Line? *Foreign Affairs.* April, 1955.

Naum, J. Der Sowjetische Staatshaushalt. *Finanzarchiv.* No. 1, 1954.

Die Neuen Parteistatuten in den Ostblockstaaten. *Osteuropa.* February, 1955.

Pavlyuk, M. Real Size of the Population of the USSR Today. *Ukrainian Quarterly.* Summer, 1954.

Pipes, R. Muslims of Soviet Central Asia (I). *Middle East Journal.* Spring, 1955.

Pool, I. de S. Satellite Generals. Stanford, Hoover Institute Studies, Series B, No. 5, 1955.

Poralla, C. Die Jüngste Rechtsentwicklung in Polen unter Besonderer Berücksichtigung der Gesetzgebung von 1950 bis 1952. Berlin, Berichte des Osteuropa Instituts an der Freien Universität Berlin, Heft 12, 1954.

Possony, S. T. Communism and Air Power. *Air University Quarterly Review.* Winter, 1954–1955.

Potts, R. D., Jr. The Foundations of Soviet Air Power. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.* May, 1955.

Quiason, C. D. A Brief Examination of Fundamental Soviet Legal Principles. *Philippine Law Journal.* December, 1954.

Rumänien (Länderbericht). *Weltwirtschaft.* December, 1954.

Schiller, O. Die Problematik der Jugoslawischen Agrarpolitik. *Berichte über Landwirtschaft.* No. 3, 1954.

Singer, B. D. Economics in the Kremlin. *Banker.* March, 1955.

Sowjetunion—Inneres—Landwirtschaft. *Osteuropa.* April, 1955.

La Télévision en U.R.S.S. *Articles et Documents.* January 11, 1955.

Timasheff, N. S. Urbanization, Operation Antireligion and the Decline of Religion in the USSR. *American Slavic and East European Review.* April, 1955.

Tschechoslowakei (Länderbericht). *Weltwirtschaft.* December, 1954.

Twining, N. F. General Twining Reports on Red Airpower—and Ours. *Air Force Magazine.* May, 1955.

Wolff, L. L. The Soviet Partisan Movement. *Military Review.* May, 1955.

Wood, G. M. F. The Pattern of Soviet Succession. *Military Review.* April, 1955.

Zverev's Report to Supreme Soviet on 1955 Budget. *Current Digest of the Soviet Press.* March 9, 1955.

Middle East and Africa

Aguilera, C. R. Le Nouveau Droit et la Nouvelle Justice de la Zone Espagnole du Protectorat au Maroc. *La Revue Marocaine de Droit.* January 1, 1955.

Aschinger, E. F. From an Economist's Journey to Egypt. *Swiss Review of World Affairs.* March, 1955.

Baster, J. Economic Development in Libya. *Middle Eastern Affairs.* November, 1954.

Batal, J. Notes on the New Egypt. *Muslim World.* July-October, 1954.

Bates, M. L. Tanganyika: The Development of Trust Territory. *International Organization.* February, 1955.

Bastar, J. The Economic Problems of Jordan. *International Affairs.* January, 1955.

Beer, C. W. Social Development in the Gezira Scheme. *African Affairs.* January, 1955.

Bethouart, Général. L'Union Française et l'Afrique du Nord. *Revue des Deux Mondes.* January 15, 1955.

Brown, W. J. Contemporary Africa: Trends and Issues. A Symposium. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.* March, 1955.

Coleman, J. S. The Problem of Political Integration in Emergent Africa. *Western Political Quarterly.* March, 1955.

De Fellner, C. The Changing Agriculture of the East. *Land.* No. 1, 1954.

De Kiewit, C. W. African Dilemmas. *Foreign Affairs.* April, 1955.

Étude Comparée des Lois Régissant la Nationalité dans les Pays du Proche-Orient. *Revue de Doit International de Moyen-Orient.* November, 1954.

Gorney, U. American Precedent in the Supreme Court of Israel. *Harvard Law Review.* May, 1955.

Habermann, S. J. The Iraq Development Board: Administration and Program. *Middle East Journal.* Spring, 1955.

Hallsworth, J. A. Freedom of Association and Industrial Relations in the Countries of the Near and Middle East. *International Labour Review.* November, 1954.

Hussein, A. The New Egypt: Domestic and Foreign Policies. *Vital Speeches.* March 15, 1955.

Iran. *Atlantic Monthly.* April, 1955.

Jacobson, D. The Legal System of Israel. *American Bar Association Journal.* December, 1954.

Key, K. K. The Origins of Turkish Political Parties. *World Affairs Interpreter.* Spring, 1955.

Loewy, K. Israel: Nach dem Ersten Jahr der Deutschen Reparationen. *Aussenpolitik.* March, 1955.

New Leaf for Ethiopia. *Economist.* March 12, 1955.

Nouira, N. Le Néo-Destour: Ses Caractéristiques Psychologiques et Politiques. *Politique Étrangère.* June-July, 1954.

Oram, P. A. The Agricultural Revolution in Turkey (1). *World Crops.* April, 1955.

Patai, R. Culture Change in the Muslim Town. *United Asia.* August, 1954.

Reece, G. The Horn of Africa. *International Affairs.* October, 1954.

Reed, H. A. Turkish Democracy at Crossroads. *Foreign Policy Bulletin.* March 15, 1955.

San, D. K. Recent Constitutional Developments in the Sudan. *India Quarterly.* July-September, 1954.

Sharon, A. Collective Settlements in Israel. *Town Planning Review.* January, 1955.

Sisulu, W. M. The Development of African Nationalism. *India Quarterly.* July-September, 1954.

Vesey-Fitzgerald, S. G. Le Droit Anglo-Musulman. *Revue Internationale de Droit Comparé.* June, 1954.

Viteles, H. Cooperative Settlements in Israel. *Sociology and Social Research.* January-February, 1955.

Southeast Asia

Borsa, G. L'Asia Sub-Orientale tra Comunismo e Democrazia. *La Communitá Internazionale.* July, 1954.

Constitution du Gouvernement Intérimaire du Népal. *Notes et Études Documentaires.* September 17, 1954.

Crozier, B. The Diem Regime in Southern Vietnam. *Far Eastern Survey.* April, 1955.

Ginsburg, N. S. The Great City in Southeast Asia. *American Journal of Sociology.* March, 1955.

"Humdard." The Indonesian Scene: an Indian View. *India Quarterly.* October-December, 1954.

Neues Thailändisches Staatsangehörigkeitsrecht. *Standesamt.* February 10, 1955.

Robequain, C. Difficultés Économiques dans l'Asie du Sud-Est. *Politique Étrangère.* January-February, 1955.

Southeast Asia: A Selected Bibliography. New York, American Institute of Pacific Relations, 1955.

Ton That Thien. The Influence of Indo-China on the Evolution of the French Union. *India Quarterly.* October-December, 1954.

United Nations. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Processes and Problems of Industrialization in Under-Developed Countries. New York, 1955 (E/2670 ST/ECA/29).

van der Kroef, J. Educational Development and Social Change in Indonesia. *Harvard Educational Review.* Fall, 1954.

Wertheim, W. F. Changes in Indonesia's Social Stratification. *Pacific Affairs.* March, 1955.

Pacific and Far East

Abegg, L. Japan Reconsiders. *Foreign Affairs.* April, 1955.

Angelo, F. B. The Lawyer and the Independence of our Judiciary. *Philippine Law Journal.* December, 1954.

Bosshard, W. Report from China. *Swiss Review of World Affairs.* February, 1955.

Chen, T. H. Nationalism in Chinese Communism. *World Affairs Interpreter.* Winter, 1955.

Constantine, L. The Church in China. *London Quarterly and Holborn Review.* April, 1955.

Cressey, G. B. China's First Five-Year Plan. *Foreign Policy Bulletin.* April 1, 1955.

Development Planning in the Philippines. *International Labour Review.* February, 1955.

Eyre, J. D. The Changing Role of the Former Japanese Landlord. *Land Economics.* February, 1955.

Froomkin, J. Developments in Public Finance in Communist China, 1950–1954. *Public Finance.* No. 1, 1955.

Grayson, B. L. The Organization of the Chinese Communist Army. *Armor.* March-April, 1955.

Hart, D. V. The Philippine Cooperative Movement. *Far Eastern Survey.* February and March, 1955.

Ikazaki, A. The Present and Future of Japan's Population. Tokyo, Japan Institute of Pacific Relations, 1954.

Inside Red China: An Air Force Survey. *Nation's Business.* April, 1955.

Jones, F. C. The Political Situation in Japan. *International Affairs.* April, 1955.

Lederle, J. W. Institute of Public Administration, University of the Philippines. *Public Administration Review.* Winter, 1955.

Maki, J. M. The Prime Minister's Office and Executive Power in Japan. *Far Eastern Survey.* May, 1955.

Mendel, D. H., Jr. Behind the 1955 Japanese Elections. *Far Eastern Survey.* May, 1955.

L'Organisation Militaire de la Chine Populaire. *Notes et Études Documentaires.* February 3, 1955.

Pound, R. The Chinese Civil Code in Action. *Tulane Law Review.* February, 1955.

Rabinowitz, R. W. Materials on Japanese

Law in Western Languages. *American Journal of Comparative Law.* Winter, 1955.

Rupen, R. A. Notes on Outer Mongolia since 1945. *Pacific Affairs.* March, 1955.

Takayanagi, K. Contact of the Common Law with the Civil Law in Japan. *American Journal of Comparative Law.* Winter, 1955.

Thomas, S. B. Recent Developments in Communist China (II)—Economic. *Far Eastern Survey.* February, 1955.

United Nations. Secretariat. Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. Economic Survey of Asia and the Far East, 1954. Bangkok, 1955.

United States. Bureau of the Census. The Population of Communist China, 1953. Washington, GPO, 1955.

Yamada, Y. The New Japanese Constitution. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly.* April, 1955.

Latin America

Allgemeine Grundsätze des Luftrechtes in Lateinamerika. *Zeitschrift für Luftrecht.* January 1, 1955.

Aperçu de la Nouvelle Constitution Vénézuélienne. *Revue Internationale de Droit Comparé.* April-June, 1954.

Argentina—Ley Orgánica de los Ministerios del Poder Ejecutivo. *Información Jurídica.* February, 1955.

Barrère, A. Un an de Politique Économique au Brésil. *Revue de Science et de Législation Financières.* October-December, 1954.

Bastide, R. Trois Livres sur le Brésil. (Review Article). *Revue Française de Science Politique.* January-March, 1955.

Bourricaud, F. Sur le Régime Constitutionnel du Perou. *Revue Française de Science Politique.* January-March, 1955.

Central America. *Atlantic Monthly.* March, 1955.

Faleroni, A. La Penetración Comunista en el Peronismo. *Estudios sobre el Comunismo.* January-March, 1954.

Ley Fundamental del Estado. *Guatemalteco.* July 5, 1954.

Macdonald, N. P. The Continental Policy of President Peron. *Quarterly Review.* April, 1955.

Manchester, A. K. Brazil in Transition. *South Atlantic Quarterly.* April, 1955.

Marchant, A. Industrialism, Nationalism and the People of Brazil. *Journal of International Affairs.* No. 1, 1955.

Pan American Union. Columbus Memorial Library. Bibliography on Public Administration in Latin America. Washington, 1954.

Remorino, J. Les Organismes du Travail dans la Nouvelle Législation Argentine. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly.* April, 1955.

Silva, M. Public Functionaries and the Brazilian Constitution. International Institute of Administrative Sciences (Brazilian Section), 1954.

Tannenbaum, F. The Future of Democracy in Latin America. *Foreign Affairs.* April, 1955.

Taylor, P. B. The Electoral System in Uruguay. *Journal of Politics.* February, 1955.

Vielman, J. Stabilization of the Post-Revolutionary Government in Guatemala. *Journal of International Affairs.* No. 1, 1955.

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND RELATIONS

Toward International Understanding. By Yasaka Takagi (Tokyo: Kenkyusha. 1954. Pp. vii, 180. 250 yen.)

There is at present a growing awareness of the importance of American-Japanese relations on the part of Americans, particularly in the face of the continuing tension between the Communist bloc and the Free World. In the study of the more than one hundred years that have elapsed since relations were first established between the United States and Japan can be discerned lessons for the future. The first fifty years from the arrival of Townsend Harris in Japan as American diplomatic representative in 1856 to the end of the Russo-Japanese War in 1905 witnessed one of the most cordial periods in the history of international relations of the modern age. It was an unqualified "era of good feeling" in which the United States offered tutelage to Japan in the role of guardian and mentor. It was remarkable that such genuine cordiality existed between two nations of such different cultural backgrounds and traditions. In contrast, the second half century which followed was perhaps unduly tragic, for it was a period of continuous succession of war scares, suspicion, and distrust engendered and nourished by jingoists and yellow journalism on both sides of the Pacific, which eventually culminated in a war that was perhaps neither inevitable nor necessary.

Toward International Understanding, by the Hepburn Professor Emeritus of American

Government and History at the University of Tokyo, is a work which records only partly the author's nearly forty years of selfless devotion to and unremitting efforts for the improvement of American-Japanese relations in the face of the steadily deteriorating situation in the unhappy period since World War I. The author has included two confidential letters written by him to U. S. Ambassador Joseph C. Grew in September, 1941 at a time when tension was rapidly mounting and reaching a dangerous point. These letters, published here for the first time, are a valuable addition to the source materials of the history of the period immediately preceding Pearl Harbor.

Students of Japanese government and politics will find the part on "Problems of Democracy in Japan" of special interest since it contains the author's views and comments on the Draft Constitution of March, 1946. His appraisal of the role played by Prince Konoye in 1945 in the efforts to revise the Constitution is a valuable contribution to the literature of the subject.

The author feels that Japan has "not yet developed a true understanding of the concepts of human personality and universal human rights which would be a prerequisite for the growth of any real democracy and a common basis for the establishment of a community of sympathy among free nations." Dr. Takagi realizes keenly the importance of foresight and of timing of decision and action on the part of the political leaders both domestic and international and it is to this that he devotes the third part of his volume.

Toward International Understanding is a documentation of the author's indefatigable efforts toward international peace and a search for a "new spiritual basis of life and of our civilization" which he began in 1919, a search to which he has dedicated his life. As a well-known protégé of the late Dr. Inazo Nitobe, the author is admirably qualified to write of one of Japan's greatest internationalists. This is a work which reflects the thoughts and aspirations of the liberal internationalist element in Japan—of which Professor Takagi has always been a prominent member—and as such deserves a wide audience, especially among those who are gravely concerned about the strengthening of present and future relations between Japan and the United States.—CHITOSHI YANAGA, *Yale University*.

Approaches to Economic Development. BY NORMAN S. BUCHANAN AND HOWARD S. ELLIS. (New York: The Twentieth Century Fund. 1955. Pp. xiv, 469. $5.00.)

This is a complete and very readable account of the subject under discussion. Both its analytical and its empirical aspects are effectively dealt with. The book is admirably suited, therefore, to meet both the requirements of college courses concerned with economic development and the demands of scholars and others in search of a rounded treatment of the subject. Political scientists and sociologists will find the study as useful as will economists.

The past research interests of the authors have prepared them for doing the present volume. Professor Buchanan has made notable contributions to the field of international economics and has authored what is still one of the best books on the corporation (so important in the development of advanced countries). Professor Ellis has made important contributions to the fields of money and international finance as well as to the study of the alternative arrangements open to men for the organization of economic activity. Both authors have worked in the field of investment, whereon economic development significantly depends.

The book is divided into three parts. The first part has to do with the analytical aspect of the problem. In it the authors define what is meant by an underdeveloped area, treat of the determinants of real income, consider capital accumulation and allocation, and examine the role of social, cultural, and demographic factors in development. The second part deals with economic development as recorded history. It embraces accounts of progress in the past and present and of the pace of material progress in the past; analyses of the early economic development of England and Western Europe, along with Europe overseas; and reviews of economic progress in Japan (since 1868) and the U.S.S.R.

The third part, concerned with achieving development in the contemporary world, comprises half the book. The subjects to which attention is given follow: the contribution of agricultural development to the increase of welfare; commerce and industry in economic development; domestic financing of development, both out of private savings and out of governmental funds; financing economic development out of foreign private capital and out of public loans and grants to underdeveloped countries; underdeveloped countries in international trade; a general view of economic development; and the interests and responsibilities of the United States. Statistical appendices on international differences in calorie intake, and in agricultural population pressure, and on indicators of capital inputs, together with an appendix on population growth, are included. There are included in addition six figures, 43 tables, an index of authors, and a useful subject index. The format is attractive.

Perhaps the outstanding characteristic of the work is the authors' recognition of the magnitude of the difficulties that stand in the way of economic development, difficulties that are frequently recalcitrant and sometimes unsurmountable. It is to be hoped, therefore, that the secretariats of international agencies concerned with economic development, together with the responsible officials of underdeveloped countries, will study this book and pay heed to the authors' findings and suggestions. It is to be hoped also that American legislators will give careful attention to the last chapter. —J. J. Spengler, *Duke University.*

Foreign Policy Analysis. By Feliks Gross. (New York: Philosophical Library, Inc. 1954. Pp. xxiv, 179. $3.75.)

Feliks Gross, in his own words, has attempted "to apply scientific thinking and concepts to foreign policy analysis." He views foreign policy as a "social process" in which "three essential concepts are distinguished: 1) ideology—and foreign policy objectives as part and result of the former; 2) factors as elements of power (such as economic, military, population, geographic, and other factors); 3) policies, as courses of action" (p. xv). Before reaching his basic discussion of these three points (in Chapters IV, V, and VI, respectively) he takes us through the "Scientific Approach" (Chapter I), "Causation" (Chapter II), and "Semantics and Terminology" (Chapter III). Then in Part 3 he deals with the need for "Forecast" in foreign policy (Chapter VII), and follows with a concluding chapter.

Mr. Gross' approach is from a mixed sociological-political science background. Thus he attempts what can properly be called an interdisciplinary approach. He also, quite naturally, is frequently concerned with the meaning of words, both because he wishes to use sociological terms to explain political concepts and because so many foreign policy terms are admittedly ambiguous. This word-play becomes on occasion a burden to the reader, as for example (pp. 158–59): "We usually discover an interdependence, which we call function [why not *call it* interdependence?], and which, if translated into causal relationship, might have the character of mutual simultaneous causation" [why not, "they are interacting?"]. This comes down to saying that "interdependent factors are interacting."

This is, however, one of the worst of such instances. And interspersed are a great number of historical and analytical observations of interest and importance. For instance, on pages 86 and 114 are some well-done and succinct points on the role of power in international affairs: "Power does not equate with power like two and two. The same amount of power in American hands is a different proposition from the same amount of power in Soviet hands" (p. 114). This is a simple point, but is too often overlooked in abstract discussions on power. At another place (pp. 148–51) Mr. Gross shows, with quotations, how the Russians and the British, in the crucial days just preceding the Nazi-Soviet Pact, agreed in separate secret minutes, each unknown to the other, on the alternatives among which Russia had to choose. His point, well taken, and excellently illustrated in sufficient detail, is that foreign policy alternatives can be logically analyzed by competent experts completely aside from national biases.

Specialists in international relations, whatever their reaction to the theoretical discussion, will find these interspersed "nuggets" worthwhile reading. The theoretical treatment itself will probably provoke a more mixed response. While it is, on the whole, well done, it does not leave one with the feeling that Mr. Gross has accomplished all he set out to do. But then his aim was an extremely ambitious one.

Danger in Kashmir. By Josef Korbel. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1954. Pp. xvi, 351. $5.00.)

Besides the mass of documentary and partisan literature on the Kashmir dispute there are at least two studies of general interest to the Western reader. The present work stems from Korbel's experience as Czechoslovakian member and chairman of the United Nations Commission sent out in 1948 to mediate the fighting in Kashmir. Michael Brecher's *The Struggle for Kashmir*, published two years ago (see this *Review*, Vol. 48, p. 590, June, 1954), was a doctoral dissertation based upon the available published materials plus a visit to India, Pakistan, and Kashmir in 1951–52.

The contents of the two works are similar. Each provides a general background to Kashmir affairs and then takes up systematically the story of Indian partition, the invasion and accession of Kashmir, and then the long record of the conflict and the successive attempts at mediation and solution through the United Nations. Each ends with a picture of conditions in Kashmir itself and an estimate of the international consequences of the whole dispute.

There are, however, differences in the handling of the problem by the two authors. Brecher leans heavily upon official sources and his accurate bibliography includes a record of U.N. documents—though it is less complete on Kashmir and secondary items. Korbel, in his official capacity, contributes more of personal observation and the bibliography is more casual. U.N. documentation is lacking in the latter but the author does cite such sources in his footnotes, and his appendices (five in number) provide the texts of U.N. materials on specific aspects of the problem. Chronologically, Brecher entered Kashmir at a later date, but his sources, except for Dr. Graham's fifth report, are no later than 1952 and we have, for instance, no intimation of the fall of Abdullah. Korbel's account carries through June, 1954.

A basic difference in the two works is to be found in the conclusions. Brecher appears more critical of Pakistan attitudes. He proposes that mediators get at the root of the Kashmir dispute and abandon the "fringe" approach of attempting to solve technical details of a plebiscite. Korbel places final emphasis on the problem of Communist influence and what he considers the crucial danger the free world faces in Russian infiltration into the Kashmir vacuum. He seems almost to regard any plebiscite solution as hopeless in the face of current Indian and Pakistan attitudes.

Korbel's is certainly the most readable account to date and his conversations with Sheikh Abdullah, Nehru, Bajpai, and others are dramatically told. Fleet Admiral C. W. Nimitz contributes an illuminating foreword.
—D. MACKENZIE BROWN, *University of California (Santa Barbara).*

UN: The First Ten Years. BY CLARK M. EICHELBERGER. (New York: Harper & Brothers. 1955. Pp. xii, 108. $1.75.)

A careful and informed summary of the United Nations' work and development, looking toward the prospect of charter revision. Useful because it gives in short compass an overview of the whole while supplying enough detail to make such an examination meaningful. The author is Executive Director of the American Association for the United Nations and an ardent advocate of the U. N. system but his judgments and proposals are temperate and realistic.

The United Nations and How It Works. BY DAVID CUSHMAN COYLE. (New York: The New American Library of World Literature, Inc. 1955. Pp. 208.)

A concise, handy volume on the nature, structure, and activities of the United Nations, especially useful for its summaries of the principal controversies of the first ten years.

Nationalism: Myth and Reality. BY BOYD C. SHAFER. (New York: Harcourt Brace and Company. 1955. Pp. x, 319. $5.00.)

A worthwhile attempt to wrestle once again with that powerful but indefinable force of world politics—nationalism. Focusing mainly on France, Britain, and the United States, Professor Shafer is content to show how many different factors enter into the growth of nationalism and in how many different ways its influence is exerted; from this very complexity he draws the hopeful conclusion that nationalism is not unchanging, unlimitable, or even eternal.

Political Warfare: A Guide to Competitive Coexistence. BY JOHN SCOTT. (New York: John Day Company. 1955. Pp. 249. $3.75.)

A description of the elements of political warfare, and an insistence upon the importance of such activity as an alternative to real warfare, with the further suggestion that this is not a separate, secret weapon so much as a "way" of doing things. A former foreign correspondent, the author is now assistant to the publisher of *Time.*

Survey of International Affairs, 1952. BY PETER CALVOCORESSI, ASSISTED BY KONSTANZE ISEPP. (London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1955. Pp. viii, 473. $7.20.)

Documents on International Affairs, 1952. SELECTED AND EDITED BY DENISE FOLLIOT. (London, New York, Toronto: Oxford, University Press. 1955. Pp. xvii, 529. 55s.)

The Royal Institute's highly factual and useful summary continues through a year marked by General Eisenhower's election, high hopes for the European Defense Community, and Marshal Stalin's insistence upon the inevitability of conflict among the capitalist states. George Kirk records the dismissal of King Farouk and F. C. Jones contributes the chapters on the Far East. The Documents volume is arranged to correlate with the Survey chapters.

Problems in International Relations. Edited by Andrew Gyorgy and Hubert S. Gibbs. (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1955. Pp. xiii, 313. $3.75.)

Case studies in contemporary international politics, dealing with specific aspects of the Communist challenge and Western response, the role of smaller states, ideological factors, the United Nations, and international law. The editors supply a brief analysis of each problem, and a chronological or factual article follows.

Britain and the Tide of World Affairs. By Oliver S. Franks. (London: Oxford University Press. 1955. Pp. 71. 5s.)

This thoughtful and thought-provoking little book by the former ambassador to the United States comprises the B.B.C. Reith Lectures for 1954. Its thesis is courageous, simple, and profound, namely that Britain can continue as a great power but only as a "total democracy," one in which the people accept responsibility for hard decisions and are willing to understand and support the policies they give rise to.

Sir Oliver argues further that there are three areas of association in which Britain must be primarily concerned, "three circles of life and power": the Commonwealth, the United States, and Western Europe. Each of these has undergone far-reaching changes in recent years and the author, with insight and acuity, analyzes the changes in each of the three. The British people, too, must comprehend and work from these changed conditions and, doing so, may provide a democratic foundation upon which British policy may rest. If these conditions are satisfied, Britain's influential place in the world can be assured and she can continue to make a significant contribution to the prosperity, peace and security of the future.

Imperial Policy and South Africa, 1902–10. By G. B. Pyrah. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1955. Pp. xvi, 269. $5.60.)

This interesting and useful book is built on two different but closely related themes. One is the rapid development of self-government in South Africa, which, in the decade after the Boer War, led to the establishment of the Union; the other is the relation between the imperial policies of the two major British political parties, as illustrated in South Africa. It is the latter in which the author is principally interested; his thesis is that Liberal imperial policy in this period forms a connecting link between the nineteenth-century Liberalism of Durham and Gladstone and the latter-day development of dominion status and the modern Commonwealth.

Great Britain and the United States: A History of Anglo-American Relations (1783–1952). By H. C. Allen. (New York: St Martins Press, Inc. 1955. Pp. 1024. $10.00.)

A massive study, which opens with an examination of the nature of the Anglo-American relationship and then proceeds to a detailed study of the evolution of that relationship from the days of the American Revolution to the post-World War II period. The author has recently been appointed to the Chair of American History at the University of London.

Foreign Relations of the United States: Diplomatic Papers, 1937. Vol. I. General. (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1954. Pp. viii, 1015. $4.25.)

Foreign Relations of the United States: Diplomatic Papers, 1937. Vol. II. The British Commonwealth, Europe, Near East and Africa. (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1954. Pp. vii, 971. $4.25.)

Foreign Relations of the United States: Diplomatic Papers, 1937. Vol. III. The Far East. (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1954. Pp. 1008. $4.25.)

These are the first of five volumes documenting foreign relations of the United States during 1937. Volume I is a mixed bag concerned with the lagging efforts at disarmament, the problems arising from the Spanish Civil War, efforts at international economic cooperation, the Department's reaction to proposed neutrality legislation, and other matters; Volume II is heavily weighted with negotiations concerning trade agreements, commercial concessions, and debt settlement, and reflects increasing disfavor for the policies of Hitler Germany; Volume III (to be followed by another on the same area) is devoted almost entirely to the undeclared war between Japan and China, including relevant internal developments in China.

The United States and Argentina. By Arthur P. Whitaker. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1954. Pp. xv, 262. $4.75.)

A description of the Perón regime as it relates to United States interests and objectives. More than one-half of this small volume deals with the period 1943–1954. It is the belief of the author that a long-range examination of the relations between the United States and Argentina must be focused on the Perón regime. His conclusion is that Perón's Yankeephobia is not out of line with the average Argentine view.

Latin America and the United States. By Graham H. Stuart. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. Fifth Edition. 1955. Pp. ix, 480. $6.00.)

The fourth edition of this textbook on United States-Latin American relations was published in 1945. In most instances the older chapters are brought up to date in rather summary fashion. New material has been added covering the Communist threat and the implementation of the Good Neighbor policy during World War II.

A History of United States Foreign Policy. By Julius W. Pratt. (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1955. Pp. xxiv, 808.)

A new diplomatic history that manages to touch on events through the latter part of 1954, although the post-World War II era is dealt with in about 90 pages; included are three useful introductory chapters on "The Aims of Foreign Policy," "The Tools of Diplomacy," and "The Tools of Force."

A Diplomatic History of the American People. By Thomas A. Bailey. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. 5th Edition. 1955. Pp. xxviii, 969. $6.50.)

New edition of an old text brought down through late 1954, and with the admirable bibliography similarly extended.

Crusade in Asia. By Carlos P. Romulo. (New York: John Day Company. 1955. Pp. 309. $4.00.)

The Philippines' best-known international figure writes a vigorous story of politics in his homeland, of Magsaysay's victory, of Asian relations, and of the Communist tactics and challenge in that part of the world.

Modern Colonialism: Institutions and Policies. By Thomas R. Adam. (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., Doubleday Short Studies in Political Science. 1955. Pp. viii, 88. 95¢.)

A valuable brief survey which places colonialism in a world politics setting, considers the objectives and consequences of colonialism, studies the patterns of governing, and looks into economic and social policies, and race and nationalism.

Admiral Ambassador to Russia. By William H. Standley and Arthur A. Ageton. (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co. 1955. Pp. 533. $6.00.)

Admiral Standley's report of his eighteen months' service as United States Ambassador to Russia, beginning in the crucial period of early 1942. He avoids the criticism that only hindsight makes possible, but expresses his discontent with the administration's vagueness and dilatoriness, and his resentment at the frequent special negotiators who seemed to undercut his position.

The Legal Status of the Chinese Abroad. By Huang Tsen-ming. (Taipei, Taiwan: China Cultural Service. 1954. Pp. 347.)

A reprint of a 1936 limited edition, this is a highly factual and historical survey of the national and municipal legislation of many countries, as such laws affect Chinese immigrants and aliens. The author is presently an Associate Justice of the Judicial Yuan of the Nationalist government.

A Half Century of International Problems: A Lawyer's Views. By Frederic R. Coudert, Edited by Allan Nevins. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1954. Pp. xix, 352. $4.00.)

Senior partner of Coudert Brothers, and a practicing international lawyer since the turn of the century, Mr. Coudert reveals in this collection of essays and speeches—the earliest dated 1905—a continuing interest in law, order, international community, and civilized living; Allan Nevins provides the historical setting and Philip C. Jessup the introduction.

How Can Europe Survive? By Hans F. Sennholz. (Toronto, New York, London: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc. 1955. Pp. iv, 336. $4.00.)

An examination of various schemes for European unity, from Streit and Coudenhove-Kalergi through NATO and ECSC. The real answer to the title question, according to the author, is to replace government planning and welfare state policy—which lead only to economic nationalism and conflict—with peaceful cooperation based on individual liberty and free enterprise.

Ukrainian Nationalism, 1939–1945. By John A. Armstrong. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1955. Pp. 322. $5.00.)

After briefly tracing the origins of Ukrainian nationalism the author analyzes the programs and activities of various Ukrainian nationalist groupings from the partition of Poland in 1939 to the re-establishment of the Soviet rule over the Ukraine in 1945. A major purpose of his study was to learn whether Ukrainian nationalism possessed the potentiality of arousing the emotions of the "common man." His answer is in the affirmative as far as Western Ukraine is concerned. With regard to Eastern Ukraine he found that Ukrainian nationalism attracted a large proportion of the intelligentsia, but that it "was unable to penetrate the masses of the population to any great extent."

SELECTED ARTICLES AND DOCUMENTS ON

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND RELATIONS

H. ARTHUR STEINER*

University of California (Los Angeles)

ARTICLES

International Politics and National Policies

General

Boon, H. N. De Grenzen van de Internationale Samenwerking. *Internationale Spectator* ('s-Gravenhage). May 8, 1955.

Domenach, Jean-Marie. Les Nationalismes et le Dépassement des Nations. *Esprit.* March, 1955.

Fernbach, Alfred. The Doctorate in International Affairs. *Journal of Politics.* May, 1955.

Kluke, Paul. Aufgaben und Methoden Zeitgeschichtlicher Forschung. *Europa Archiv.* April 5, 1955.

Lavau, Georges-E. Valeur Présente de la Souveraineté des États. *Esprit.* March, 1955.

Lipsky, George A. The Theory of International Relations of Harold D. Lasswell. *Journal of Politics.* February, 1955.

Snyder, Richard C. Toward Greater Order in the Study of International Politics [review article]. *World Politics.* April, 1955.

Thompson, Kenneth W. Beyond National Interest: A Critical Evaluation of Reinhold Niebuhr's Theory of International Politics. *Review of Politics.* April, 1955.

Tseng, Beauson. Nationalism: A Minority View. *Free China Review.* February, 1955.

Wandycz, Piotr S. The Theory of International Relations. *Review of Politics.* April, 1955.

United States

Armstrong, John P. The Enigma of Senator Taft and American Foreign Policy. *Review of Politics.* April, 1955.

Beloff, Max. The Foundations of American Policy. *Spectator.* February 25 and March 4, 1955.

Graig, G. M. On Understanding American Foreign Policy. *International Journal.* Spring, 1955.

The Department of State, 1930–1955: Expanding Functions and Responsibilities. *Department of State Bulletin.* March 21 and 28, 1955.

Ferris, John P. Some Lessons of the U.S.-India Foreign Aid Program. *Public Administration Review.* Spring, 1955.

Fox, William T. R. Civilians, Soldiers, and American Military Policy. *World Politics.* April, 1955.

Fund for Adult Education. *World Affairs Are Your Affairs.* Pasadena, 1955.

Henderson, Loy. The Foreign Service as a Career. *Department of State Bulletin.* April 18, 1955.

Kalijarvi, Thorsten V. The Relative Power Positions of the Free World and the Soviet Bloc. *Department of State Bulletin.* May 16, 1955.

Key, David McK. The Role of Our Government in International Educational Exchange. *Department of State Bulletin.* March 7, 1955.

Kissinger, Henry A. American Policy and Preventive War. *Yale Review.* March, 1955.

Liska, Firi. The Multiple Equilibrium and the American National Interest in International Organization. *Harvard Studies in International Affairs.* February, 1954.

Murphy, Robert D. Our Bond with Free

---

[*] Prepared with the assistance of Mr. P. Allan Dionisopoulos.

Asia. *Department of State Bulletin.* March 28, 1955. Our Policies in Asia. *Ibid.* May 23, 1955.

National Planning Association. Using American Agricultural Surpluses Abroad; A Statement . . . and a Report. . . . Planning Pamphlet No. 91. Washington, 1955.

Neumann, Robert. Les Consequences sur la Politique Extérieure des États-Unis de Certains Aspects de la Vie Politique Intérieure du Pays. *Politique Étrangère.* January-February, 1955.

Plans for U. S. Participation in Geneva Conference on Atomic Energy [including agenda]. *Department of State Bulletin.* March 14, 1955.

Stassen, Harold E. America and Asia. *Pacific Spectator.* Spring, 1955. Developing U. S. Policy on Disarmament. *Department of State Bulletin.* May 16, 1955.

Walters, Byron S. America in Asia; Operation Stalemate. *Queen's Quarterly.* Spring, 1955.

American Republics

Alexander, Robert. Peronism and Argentina's Quest for Leadership in Latin America. *Journal of International Affairs.* 1955 (no. 1).

Eisenhower, Milton S. Partnership for Progress in the Americas. *Southwest Review.* Spring, 1955.

Figueres, José. The Problems of Democracy in Latin America. *Journal of International Affairs.* 1955 (no. 1).

Galindoz, Jesús de. Anti-American Sentiment in Latin America. *Journal of International Affairs.* 1955 (no. 1).

Grant, Donald. Guatemala and United States Foreign Policy. *Journal of International Affairs.* 1955 (no. 1).

Halle, Louis J. Why We Are Losing Latin America. *Harper's.* April, 1955.

Hayn, Rolf. Peruvian Monetary and Foreign Exchange Policy, 1940–1945. *Inter-American Economic Affairs.* Spring, 1955.

Holland, Henry F. U. S. Relations with the American Republics. *Department of State Bulletin.* April 11, 1955.

Macdonald, N. P. The Continental Policy of President Peron. *Quarterly Review.* April, 1955.

Pike, Frederick B. Guatemala, the United States, and Communism in the Americas. *Review of Politics.* April, 1955.

Rippy, J. Fred. U. S. Government Assistance to the Underdeveloped Countries, 1945–1954. *Inter-American Economic Affairs.* Spring, 1955.

Commonwealth of Nations

Airey, Willis. New Zealand Foreign Policy Related to New Zealand Social Development and Current World Trends. Wellington, New Zealand Student Labour Federation, 1955.

Carrington, C. E. A New Theory of the Commonwealth. *International Affairs.* April, 1955.

Peffer, Nathaniel. Australia: America's Uneasy Ally. *Yale Review.* March, 1955.

Western and Central Europe

France's Foreign Policy [symposium]. *Current History.* May, 1955.

The Hard Road to an Austrian Treaty. *World Today.* May, 1955.

Kayser, Jacques. La Presse de Province en France et l'Évolution de la Situation Internationale. *Politique Étrangère.* January-February, 1955.

Lasorgue, Bertrand. L'Affaire Sarroise. *Revue de Défense Nationale.* March, 1955.

Nicolson, Harold. The Origins and Development of the Anglo-French Entente. *International Affairs.* October, 1954.

Report on the Saar [symposium]. *The Statist.* February, 1955.

Smith, Reginald H. Westeuropa und der Industrialisierungs Prozess in den Unterentwickelten Ländern. *Europa Archiv.* March 20, 1955.

Stempels, A. Europese Impulsen uit de Volken. *Internationale Spectator.* May 8, 1955.

Svennevig, Tormed P. The Scandinavian Bloc in the United Nations. *Social Research.* Spring, 1955.

Tingsten, Herbert. The Debate on Sweden's Foreign Policy. *American-Scandinavian Review.* March, 1955.

Udink, B. J. De Ontwikkeling van het Duitse en van het Nederlandse Standpunt Inzake de Vrije Vaart op de Duitse Rijn sedert 1945. *Internationale Spectator.* May 8, 1955.

The German Question

Abs, Hermann J. Germany and the London and Paris Agreements. *International Affairs.* April, 1955.

After E.D.C.; German Cooperation with the West. *Round Table.* December, 1954.

Altmeyer, Klaus. Die Dokumente vom 5 Juni 1945 und die Politische Einheit Deutschlands. *Europa Archiv.* March 5, 1955.

Bishop, Joseph, Jr. The Contractual Agreements with the Federal Republic of Germany.

American Journal of International Law. April, 1955.

Briggs, Herbert W. The Final Act of the London Conference on Germany. *American Journal of International Law.* April, 1955.

Federal Republic of Germany Gains Sovereignty, Accedes to North Atlantic Treaty [with documents]. *Department of State Bulletin.* May 16, 1955.

Germany's Foreign Policy [symposium]. *Current History.* April, 1955.

Hiscocks, C. R. Germany Goes West. *Queen's Quarterly.* Winter, 1955.

Loewenstein, Karl. The Bonn Constitution and the European Defense Community Treaties. *Yale Law Journal.* May, 1955.

The Rearming of Germany. *Army Combat Forces Journal.* April, 1955.

U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe

Aron, Raymond. Permanence and Flexibility in Soviet Foreign Policy. *Problems of Communism.* May-June, 1955.

Drachkovitch, M. M. Le "New-Look" de la Politique Extérieure Soviétique. *Les Cahiers de Bruges Quarterly.* March, 1955.

Gascoigne, Alvary. Russian Policy since 1945. *Journal of the Royal United Service Institution.* February, 1955.

Margolis, Emanuel. Soviet Views on the Relationship between National and International Law. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly.* January, 1955.

Mosely, Philip E. Russia After Stalin. Foreign Policy Association Headline Series, No. 111. May-June, 1955.

Pipes, Richard. Muslims of Soviet Central Asia; Trends and Prospects. *Middle East Journal.* Spring and Summer, 1955.

Skilling, H. Gordon. The Soviet Impact on the Czechoslovak Legal Revolution. *Soviet Studies.* April, 1955.

The Swing of the Soviet Pendulum 1953–1955. *British Survey.* April, 1955.

Valkenier, Elizabeth K. Eastern European Federation; A Study in the Conflicting National Aims and Plans of the Exile Groups. *Journal of Central European Affairs.* January, 1955.

Balkans and Eastern Mediterranean

Anthem, Thomas. Prospects in Cyprus. *Contemporary Review.* March, 1955.

Djerdja, J. La Yougoslavie et les Nouveaux États Asiatiques. *Politique Etrangère.* January-February, 1955.

From Zone B and Istria: Conditions in Istria after the London Agreement. *Trieste Political Review.* January-February, 1955.

Sturmhöfel, Heinz. Die Türkei und die Sowjetunion 1939–1954. *Ost-Europa.* February, 1955.

Tončić-Sorinj, Lujo. Das Schicksal Triests. Seine Bedeutung und Stellung in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart. *Europa Archiv.* April 20, 1955.

Wainman, Alexander W. Yugoslavia and its Neighbors. *International Journal.* Spring, 1955.

Middle East and South Asia

Boutros-Ghali, D. Y. The Arab League 1945–1955. *International Conciliation.* No. 498, May, 1954. [1955.]

Bruhns, Fred C. A Study of Arab Refugee Attitudes. *Middle East Journal.* Spring, 1955.

Das Gupta, A. K. India's Foreign Economic Policy. *India Quarterly.* July-September, 1954.

Dorsey, Stephen P. Social Discontent in the Near East; A Challenge to Public Responsibility. *Department of State Bulletin.* May 9, 1955.

Desai, W. S. India and Burma: A Study. Bombay, Indian Council of World Affairs, 1954.

Kumarasundram, S. India's Postwar Demand for Imports. *International Monetary Fund Staff Papers.* February, 1955.

Mayfield, Robert C. A Geographic Study of the Kashmir Issue. *Geographical Review.* April, 1955.

McKittrick, T. E. M. Strategy in the Middle East. *Political Quarterly.* April–June, 1955.

Quilliam, C. D. The Anglo-Egyptian Treaty. *Queen's Quarterly.* Winter, 1955.

Raghavan, Nedyam. India and Malaya: A Study. Bombay, Indian Council of World Affairs, 1954.

Raleigh, J. S. Ten Years of the Arab League. *Middle Eastern Affairs.* March, 1955.

Rao, P. R. Ramachandra. India and Ceylon: A Study. Bombay, Indian Council of World Affairs, 1954.

Rivera, W. F. The Position of Foreign Business in India Today. *Pacific Affairs.* March, 1955.

Spencer, Daniel L. Foreign Participation in South Asian Enterprises. *Far Eastern Survey.* March, 1955.

Stone, William T. Middle East Conflicts. *Editorial Research Reports.* April 13, 1955.

Tyson, Geoffrey. Foreign Investment in India. *International Affairs.* April, 1955.

Whitton, D. Anglo-Egyptian Relations. *Australian Outlook.* December, 1954.

Africa

Algérie [symposium]. *Monde Nouveau.* March, 1955.

Bates, Margaret L. Tanganyika; The Development of a Trust Territory. *International Organization.* February, 1955.

Carter, Gwendolen M. South Africa. Foreign Policy Association Headline Series, No. 109. January–February, 1955.

Coleman, James S. The Problem of Political Integration in Emergent Africa. *Western Political Quarterly.* March, 1955.

Italy and Eritrea. *Italian Affairs.* January, 1955.

Lacheraf, Mostefa. Le Patriotisme Rural en Algérie. *Esprit.* March, 1955.

Power, Thomas F., Jr. Libya and the United Nations. *United Nations Review.* May, 1955.

Ruanda-Urundi [symposium]. *United Nations Review.* May, 1955.

Tanganyika [symposium]. *United Nations Review.* May, 1955.

Unrest in French North Africa. *World Today.* April, 1955.

Pacific and Far East

Ball, W. Macmahon. Whither Japan? *Australian Outlook.* December, 1954.

Barzini, Luigi. In der Höhle des Papiertigers. *Der Monat.* May, 1955.

Chou, I-kua. Communist China's Foreign Policy. *American Scholar.* Spring, 1955.

Formosa. *British Survey.* February, 1955.

Kaneshige, Kankuro. Japan-U.S. Radiobiological Conference. *Contemporary Japan.* Vol. 23, nos. 4–6, 1955.

Kimura, Kihachiro. International Development and Japanese Economy. *Contemporary Japan.* Vol. 23, nos. 4–6, 1955.

Kugimoto, Hisaharu. UNESCO Activities in Japan. *Contemporary Japan.* Vol. 23, nos. 4–6, 1955.

Lévy, Roger. Le Japon entre les États-Unis et la Chine. *Politique Étrangère.* January–February, 1955.

Lindsay, Michael. Chinese Foreign Policy. *International Journal.* Spring, 1955.

Marchand, Jean. L'Asie en Face du Monde Libre. *Écrits de Paris.* January, 1955.

Maurer, Merrymon. Formosa and Free World Policy. *New Leader.* April 4, 1955.

Ono, Isamu. The New International Position of Japan. Tokyo, Japan Institute of Foreign Affairs, Inc., 1954.

Palmer, Norman D. Organizing for Peace in Asia. *Western Political Quarterly.* March, 1955.

Stone, William T. Relations with Japan. *Editorial Research Reports.* April 27, 1955.

Swearingen, Rodger. The Threat of Chinese Imperialism; A New Dimension to the Conflict. *World Affairs Interpreter.* Spring, 1955.

Trade Between China and the Soviet Bloc. *World Today.* May, 1955.

Southeast Asia

Brant, Charles S. The Case for Burma. *Antioch Review.* Spring, 1955.

Fall, Bernard B. Indochina since Geneva. *Pacific Affairs.* March, 1955.

Golay, Frank. Economic Consequences of the Philippine Trade Act. *Pacific Affairs.* March, 1955.

Henderson, William. New Nations of Southeast Asia. Foreign Policy Association Headline Series, No. 110. March–April, 1955.

Palmier, Leslie H. Indonesia and the West. *International Affairs.* April, 1955.

Prosser, Lamar M. The Bloody Lessons of Indochina. *Army Combat Forces Journal.* June, 1955.

Asian-African Conference

Cousins, Norman. Report from Bandung. *Saturday Review.* May 21, 1955.

Mason, Philip. Afro-Asian Conference Prospects. *Royal Central Asian Journal.* April, 1955.

Vernant, Jacques. Une Force Asiatico-Africaine? *Revue de Défense Nationale.* March, 1955.

International Economic Policy and Relations

Auboin, Roger. The Bank for International Settlements, 1930–1955. *Princeton Essays in International Finance*, No. 22. May, 1955.

Brovedani, Bruno. Latin American Medium-Term Import Stabilization Policies and the Adequacy of Reserves. *International Monetary Fund Staff Papers.* February, 1955.

Development Policy in Underdeveloped Countries [symposium]. *American Economic Review.* May, 1955.

Fforde, J. S. Cyclical Fluctuations and the Growth of Discriminating Alignments in International Trade. *Economic Journal.* March, 1955.

Fliegers, Serge. The Financing of Latin America's Economic Development. *Journal of International Affairs.* Vol. 9, no. 1, 1955.

G.A.T.T.: An Analysis and Appraisal of the

General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. New York, United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, 1955.

Gini, Corrado. Delle Migrazioni Internazionali. *Rivista di Politica Economica.* March, 1955.

Higgins, Benjamin, and Wilfred Malenbaum. Financing Economic Development. *International Conciliation.* No. 502, March, 1955.

Long-Term Trends in International Trade [symposium]. *American Economic Review.* May, 1955.

Mattera, Albert A. Foreign Exchange Budgets in Latin America. *International Monetary Fund Staff Papers.* February, 1955.

Morris, R. L. The Purchasing Power of British Exports. *Economica.* February, 1955.

Myint, H. The Gains from International Trade and the Backward Countries. *Review of Economic Studies* (Cambridge). Vol. 22(2), no. 58, 1954–55.

Oliver, Robert W. An Aspect of Economic Nationalism. *World Affairs Interpreter.* Spring, 1955.

Philipp, André. La Place de L'Europe dans le Commerce International. *Monde Nouveau.* January, 1955.

Das Problem der Konvertibilität des Europäischen Währungen. *Europa Archiv.* February 20, 1955.

Radford, R. A. Canada's Capital Inflow, 1946–53. *International Monetary Fund Staff Papers.* February, 1955.

Regional Economics [symposium]. *American Economic Review.* May, 1955.

Rothenberg, Jerome. Patterns of Economic Cooperation in 1955. *World Affairs Interpreter.* Spring, 1955.

Taft, Charles P. International Trade and the National Interest. *Southwest Review.* Spring, 1955.

Townsend, David. The Economic Role of International Monetary Blocs. *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly.* March, 1955.

International Law

1954 Annual Survey of American Law: Pt. I, Public Law in General. *New York University Law Review.* January, 1955.

Bastid, Suzanne. Les Conditions Juridiques de la "Coexistence." *Politique Étrangère.* January–February, 1955.

Corbett, P. E. The New Look in International Jurisprudence [review article]. *World Politics.* April, 1955.

Delaume, Georges René. Marital Property and American-French Conflict of Laws. *American Journal of Comparative Law.* Winter, 1955.

The Difficult Quest for a Uniform Maritime Law . . . *Yale Law Journal.* May, 1955.

Domke, Martin. The United Nations Draft Convention on Restrictive Business Practices. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly.* January, 1955.

Farran, C. D'Olivier. International Enclaves and the Question of State Servitudes. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly.* April, 1955.

Gidel, Gilbert. The Continental Shelf. [University of Western Australia] *Annual Law Review.* Dedember, 1954.

Green, Sedgwick W. Applicability of American Laws to Overseas Areas Controlled by the United States. *Harvard Law Review.* March, 1955.

Grzybowski, Kazimierz. The Soviet Doctrine of *mare clausum* and Policies in Black and Baltic Seas. *Journal of Central European Affairs.* January, 1955.

The Hydrogen Bomb Experiments [symposium]. *Yale Law Journal.* May, 1955.

Jessup, Philip C. The International Law Commission's 1954 Report on the Regime of the Territorial Sea. *American Journal of International Law.* April, 1955.

Johnson, D. H. N. The Case of Monetary Gold Removed from Rome in 1943. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly.* January, 1955.

O'Connell, D. P. A Critique of the Iranian Oil Litigation. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly.* April, 1955.

O'Connell, D. P. Sedentary Fisheries and the Australian Continental Shelf. *American Journal of International Law.* April, 1955.

Persico, Avv. G. L'Associazione Internazionale di Diritto Penale. *Revue de Droit International de Sciences Diplomatiques et Politiques.* January–March, 1955.

Roberts, W. Lewis. Litigation Involving "Termination of War." *Kentucky Law Journal.* Winter, 1955.

Taylor, Telford. The Nuremberg Trials. *Columbia Law Review.* April, 1955.

International Organization

United Nations and Specialized Agencies

Black, Eugene R. Deutschland und die Weltbank. *Europa Archiv.* March 20, 1955.

Council Condemns Gaza Attack. *United Nations Review.* June, 1955.

Cuatrecasas, Juan. Qué ha hecho la UNESCO en España? *Cuadernos Americanos.* May–June, 1955.

De Rusett, Alan. Large and Small States in International Organization. *International Affairs.* April, 1955.

Feinberg, Nathan. L'Exclusion de la Société des Nations et le Principe de l'Unanimité. *Revue de Droit International de Sciences Diplomatiques et Politiques.* January–March, 1955.

The First Ten Years. *United Nations Review.* June, 1955.

Lourie, Sylvain. The United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan. *International Organization.* February, 1955.

The Research Work of the International Labour Office. *International Labour Review.* February, 1955.

Röling, B. V. A. De Negende Algemene Vergadering van de Verenigde Naties. *Internationale Spectator.* March 8, 1955.

van Kleffens, E. N. De Verenigde Naties aan het Einde van Haar Eerste Decennium. *Internationale Spectator.* April 8, 1955.

Wriggins, Howard, and Edwin A. Bock. The Status of the United Nations Secretariat; Role of the Administrative Tribunal. New York, Woodrow Wilson Foundation, 1954.

UN Charter Review

Anglin, Douglas G. Revision of the United Nations Charter. *University of Toronto Quarterly.* January, 1955.

Black, Joseph E. The United Nations Charter: Problems of Review and Revision. *University of Cincinnati Law Review.* Winter, 1955.

Ghoshal, A. K. Some Reflections of the Mode of Revision of the U. N. Charter. *Indian Journal of Political Science.* October–December, 1954.

Gross, Ernest A. United Nations Charter Review. *Social Action.* December, 1954.

Hostie, Jan F. Reflections of an European Lawyer on Revision of the United Nations Charter. *Tulane Law Review.* April, 1955.

Pal, Khagendra Chandra. Revision of the U. N. Charter. *Indian Journal of Political Science.* October–December, 1954.

Military and Security Questions

Gruenther, Alfred M. Developing Strength for European Defense. *Department of State Bulletin.* March 28, 1955.

Hilsman, Roger. Research in Military Affairs [review article]. *World Politics.* April, 1955.

Horrocks, Brian. Middle East Defense—British View. *Middle Eastern Affairs.* February, 1955.

Ismay, Lord. The First Five Years of NATO. *Department of State Bulletin.* March 28, 1955. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization. *Journal of the Royal United Service Institution.* February, 1955.

Jernegan, John D. Middle East Defense. *Department of State Bulletin.* April 4, 1955.

Middle East Defense. *Round Table.* March, 1955.

Montgomery, Viscount. NATO and the Defense of the Free World. *Pacific Spectator.* Spring, 1955.

Pearson, Lester B. Western European Union; Implications for Canada and NATO. *International Journal.* Winter, 1954–1955.

Pépy, Daniel. Vers un Pool Européen des Armements? *Monde Nouveau.* February, 1955.

Perkins, George W. What NATO Means to Americans. *Department of State Bulletin.* April 25, 1955.

Sokol, Anthony. Naval Aspects of European Integration. *Military Review.* June, 1955.

Van Alstyne, Richard W. New Patterns of Military Cooperation. *World Affairs Interpreter.* Spring, 1955.

Regional Organization

Die Assoziierung Grossbritanniens mit der Europäischen Gemeinschaft für Kohle und Stahl [documents]. *Europa Archiv.* March 5, 1955.

Basch, Antonin. The Colombo Plan; A Case of Regional Economic Cooperation. *International Organization.* February, 1955.

Bebr, Gerhard. Regional Organizations; A United Nations Problem. *American Journal of International Law.* April, 1955.

Beljaars, G. A. C. Bibliographie Historique et Culturelle de l'Integration Européene. *Les Cahiers de Bruges Quarterly.* March, 1955.

Beyen, J. W. Over de Europese Integratie. *Internationale Spectator.* May 8, 1955.

Boyer, Frederic, and J. P. Salle. The Liberalization of Intra-European Trade in the Framework of OEEC. *International Monetary Fund Staff Papers.* February, 1955.

Del Vecchio, Giorgio. The United States of Europe. *Contemporary Review.* January, 1955.

Fenwick, Charles G. The Inter-American Regional System. *Journal of International Affairs.* Vol. 9, no. 1, 1955.

Goormaghtigh, John. European Coal and Steel Community. *International Conciliation.* No. 503, May, 1955.

Henri-Vignes, D. Chronique de l'Évolution Institutionnelle de la C.E.C.A. *Les Cahiers de Bruges Quarterly.* March, 1955.

Joint Parliament for Balkan Allies. *News from Turkey.* March 17, 1955.

Overzicht van de Europese Gemeenschap voor Kolen en Staal sedert Augustus 1952. *Internationale Spectator*. March 22, 1955.

Suetens, Max. All-European Economic Cooperation. *United Nations Review*. May, 1955.

DOCUMENTS

General and Miscellaneous

FAO. The Director-General's Program of Work and Budget for 1956 and 1957. . . . Rome, 1955. (Doc. C/55/5; 10 March 1955.)

——— Conference. Budget for 1955. . . . Rome, 1954.

French Embassy. Service de Presse et d' Information. Full Texts of the Quadripartite Agreements between Cambodia, France, Laos and Vietnam signed in Paris on December 29, 1954. (Indochinese Affairs No. 8.) Full Texts of the Bilateral Conventions between France and Vietnam signed in Paris on December 30, 1954. (Indochinese Affairs No. 9.) New York, 1955.

International Court of Justice. Reports of Judgments, Advisory Opinions and Orders, 1954. The Hague, 1954. (Sales Nos. 112–129.)

International Labour Office. The I.L.O. and Asia. New York, Institute of Pacific Relations (Secretariat Paper No. 7), 1954.

International Monetary Fund. The Economic Development of Nigeria [economic survey mission report]. Washington, 1955.

O.E.E.C. Bibliographies de l'O.E.C.E., 1951–1954. Paris, O.E.E.C. n.d.

——— Economic Conditions in Overseas Territories. Paris, O.E.E.C., 1954. (Doc. EC(55)4.)

——— The Iron and Steel Industry in Europe. Paris, O.E.E.C., 1955. (Doc. IS (54)22.)

United Kingdom. Central Office of Information. British Foreign Policy; A Brief Collection of Fact and Quotation. London, [1954].

——— ——— Formosa and the Offshore Islands. London, 1955. (No. R. 3001.)

UNESCO. Contribution of the Social Sciences to the Study of Social Conditions in the African Non-Self-Governing Territories. Report prepared by UNESCO, 10 March 1955. (UN Doc. A/AC.35/L.194.)

——— Measures for the Eradication of Illiteracy in Non-Self-Governing Territories. Part I, 18 April 1955. (UN Doc. A/AC.35 /L.208.)

——— Tentative International Bibliography of Works dealing with Press Problems, 1900–1952. Paris, UNESCO, 1954.

World Health Organization. Proposed Programme and Budget Estimates for the Financial Year 31 December 1956. . . . Geneva, WHO, 1954. (WHO Official Records, No. 58.)

——— Director-General. The Work of WHO 1954. Annual Report. . . . Geneva, WHO, 1955. (WHO Official Records, No. 59.)

Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia's Foreign Policy. [Extract from Statement of President Tito to the Federal Assembly.] *Review of International Affairs* (Belgrade), March 15, 1955.

United Nations

All entries under this heading bear the imprint of the United Nations (New York), 1955, unless a different place or date is shown.

ECOSOC. Economic Development of Under-developed Countries; Evolution and Functioning of Development Corporations. (Doc. E/2690, 28 February 1955.)

——— Freedom of Information; Legal Aspects of the Rights and Responsibilities of the Media of Information. (Doc. E/2698.)

——— Progress made by the United Nations in the Field of Social Welfare during the Period 1 January 1953–31 December 1954 and Proposals for the Programme of Work 1955–57. (Doc. E/CN.5/308.)

——— World Economic Situation. . . . Full Employment. . . . Replies from Governments to the Questionnaire. . . . (Doc. E/2726, 15 April 1955.)

——— Commission on Human Rights. Review of the Human Rights Programme. Memorandum by the Secretary-General. (Doc. E/CN.4/710, 1 February 1955.)

——— Commission on International Commodity Trade. First Report . . . on the First Session of the Commission. . . . (Doc. E/2745, 18 May 1955.)

——— Commission on Narcotic Drugs. The Proposed Single Convention. . . . (Doc. E/CN.7/295, 11 February 1955.)

——— Committee on the Enforcement of International Arbitral Awards. Protocol on Arbitration Clauses, Geneva, 24 September 1923. (Doc. E/AC.42/2, 16 February 1955.)

——— ECAFE. Report by the FAO. Bangkok. (Doc. E/CN.11/401, 9 February 1955.)

——— ——— Technical Assistance Activities in Economic Development and Public Administration in the ECAFE Region, 1954, by the TAA. Bangkok. (Doc. E/CN.11/398, 26 January 1955.)

——— ——— UNESCO Activities in 1954 and Work Plans for 1955–1956 of Interest to the ECAFE. Bangkok. (Doc. E/CN.11/402, 9 February 1955.)

——— ECE. List of Documents Issued from 9 March 1954 up to 14 March 1955. Geneva. (Doc. E/ECE/INF/69, 14 March 1955.)

——— ——— Reports from the Committees of the Commission on their Activities. . . . Geneva. (Doc. E/ECE/195, 31 January 1955.)

——— ——— Report of the Special Group of Experts on Southern Europe. Geneva. (Doc. E/ECE/198, 18 February 1955.)

——— ECLA. Foreign Capital in Latin America. (Doc. E/CN.12/360; ST/ECA/28, Nov. 1954.)

———. Interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements. Review of International Commodity Problems, 1954. (Doc. E/2672, 7 April 1955.)

——— Population Commission. Gaps in Existing Knowledge of the Relationships between Population Trends and Economic and Social Conditions. Report of a Committee of Experts. . . . (Doc. E/CN.9/119, 17 January 1955.)

——— TAC. Technical Assistance Activities under the Expanded Program . . . as at 31 December 1954. (Doc. E/TAC/REP/31, 18 February 1955.)

General Assembly. Committee on South-West Africa. Information and Documentation in respect of the Territory of South-West Africa. (Doc. A/AC.73/L.7, 13 May 1955; and A/AC.73/L.7/Add.1.)

——— High Commissioner for Refugees. A United Nations Plan for Refugees. Geneva, 1955. (Sales No.: 1955.I.4.)

——— International Law Commission. Regime of the Territorial Sea. Comments by Governments on the Provisional Articles. . . . (Doc. A/CN.4/90, 29 March 1955.)

——— Special Committee on Review of Administrative Tribunal Judgments. Judicial Review of Administrative Tribunal Judgments. Working Paper submitted by the Secretary-General. (Doc. A/AC.78/L.1, 22 March 1955.)

——— ——— Participation of Individuals in Proceedings before the ICJ. Memorandum submitted by the Secretary-General. (Doc. A/AC.78/L.10, 13 April 1955.)

Secretariat. Social Change and Standards of Living in Non-Self-Governing Territories. Preliminary note. . . . (Doc. A/AC.35/L.198, 24 March 1955.)

——— Technical Assistance and UNICEF Aid in Non-Self-Governing Territories. Report prepared by the Secretariat. (Doc. A/AC. 35/L.201, 4 April 1955.)

——— Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Review of Economic Activity in Africa, 1950–1954. (Sales No.: 1955.II.C.3.)

——— ——— Study on Expulsion of Immigrants. (Sales No.: 1955.IV.6.)

——— Department of Public Information. Guide to the Charter of the United Nations. 4th edition. (Sales No.: 1955.I.[11].)

——— ——— Ten Years of United Nations Publications, 1945 to 1955; A Complete Catalogue. December, 1954. (Sales No.: 1955.I.8.)

——— Executive Office of the Secretary-General. General Information for the Guidance of Permanent Missions to the United Nations. (Doc. ST/SG/4, 7 March 1955.)

——— Headquarters Library. A Bibliography of the Charter of the United Nations. Bibliographical Series No. 3. (ST/LIB/SER. B/3, April 1955; Sales No.: 1955.I.7 ($1.25).)

——— Legislative Series. Laws Concerning Nationality. 1954. (Doc. ST/LEG/SER.B/4.)

——— Statistical Office. List of Statistical Series Collected by International Organizations; Statistical Papers, Series M, no. 11/Rev. 1. 1955.

Security Council. Report . . . to the Council of the Organization of American States acting provisionally as Organ of Consultation in compliance with . . . the Resolution Approved by the Council on 11 January 1955. (Doc. S/3366/Add.1, 2 March 1955.)

——— Chief of Staff to the Truce Supervision Organization. Report . . . concerning the SS. *Bat Galim.* (Doc. S/3323, 29 November 1954.)

——— ——— Report . . . concerning the Incident of 28 February 1955 near Gaza. (Doc. A/3373, 17 March 1955.)

——— ——— Report . . . as to the observance of the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Syria. Letter dated 28 March 1955 . . . [transmitting observations by Syria on the Report]. (Doc. S/3343/Add.1, 4 April 1955.)

Trusteeship Council. United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in East Africa, 1954: (1) Report on the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi (Doc. T/1141, 8 December 1954); (2) Report on the Trust Territory of Somaliland (Doc. T/1143, 20 December 1954); (3) Report . . . on Tanganyika (Doc T/1142, 23 December 1954.)

United Nations Conference of Non-Governmental-Organizations Interested in the Eradication of Prejudice and Discrimination, Exchange of Views Concerning the Most Effective Means of Combatting Prejudice and Discrimination . . . . (Doc. E/NGO/Conf.1/2, 7 February 1955.)

United States

Unless otherwise indicated, all entries under this heading bear the imprint: "Washington: Government Printing Office, 1955"; and the Congressional materials are those of the 84th Congress, 1st Session.

Congress

House. United States Contributions to International Organizations. Letter from the Secretary of State. . . . H. Doc. 80, January 26, 1955.

——— Committee on Appropriations. Department of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1956. Hearings. . . .

——— Committee on Armed Services. Subcommittee for Special Investigations. Investigation of Spanish Airbase Construction Program. (1) Report and Hearings . . . Feb. 1 and 2, 1955. (2) Hearing . . . Mar. 16, 1955.

——— Committee on Foreign Relations. Survey Mission to the Far East, South Asia, and the Middle East. Report . . . March 24, 1955.

——— Committee on Ways and Means. Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955. Report. . . . H. Report No. 50, February 14, 1955.

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Report of the Proposed Agreement with NATO for Cooperation regarding Atomic Information. Report . . . May 4, 1955. S. Report. No. 267.

Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. The Bonn Agreements of 1952 as Amended by the Paris Protocol of 1954. . . . S. Doc. No. 11.

——— ——— Mutual Security Act of 1955. (1) Hearings . . . May 5 . . . 23, 1955. (2) Report . . . May 27, 1955. S. Report No. 383.

——— ——— Protocol on the Termination of the Occupation Regime in the Federal Republic of Germany and Protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the Accession of the Federal Republic of Germany. (1) Hearings . . . March 29 and 30, 1955. (2) Report. . . . Exec. Report No. 6.

——— ——— Statement by Gen. Alfred Gruenther, USA, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, and United States Commander in Chief, Europe. Hearing . . . March 26, 1955.

——— ——— Subcommittee on Technical Assistance Programs. (1) Multilateral Technical Assistance Programs. Staff Study No. 1. March 11, 1955. (2) Organization and Administration of Technical Assistance Programs. Staff Study No. 2. April 8, 1955. Committee Prints.

——— ——— Subcommittee on the United Nations Charter. (1) Hearings. . . . Part 8 (Atlanta, March 17, 1955), Part 9 (Miami, March 18, 1955). (2) The International Court of Justice. Staff Study No. 8. (3) Interim Report. . . . S. Report No. 14, January 26, 1955.

Executive Departments

Department of State. The American as International Traveler and Host. (Pub. No. 5702.)

——— Area Study Programs in American Universities. (Pub. No. 5668.)

——— The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT); an Explanation. . . . (Pub. No. 5813.)

——— Informal Report by the U. S. Delegation, Eighth Session, the General Conference of UNESCO; November 12–December 10, 1954, Montevideo, Uruguay. (Pub. No. 5777.)

——— Partners in International Understanding; 13th Semiannual Report of the International Educational Exchange Program. (Pub. No. 5752.)

——— Report of the United States of America to the UNESCO, 1952–1953. (Pub. No. 5791.)

——— Tenth Inter-American Conference: Caracas, Venezuela, March 1–28, 1954. (Pub. No. 5692.)

——— The United States and Germany, 1945–1955. (Pub. No. 5827.)

Foreign Operations Administration. Free World Trade Controls for Peace.

——— FOA and Voluntary Agencies.

——— Technical Cooperation in Agriculture.

Library of Congress. Introduction to Asia; A Selective Guide to Background Reading. Library of Congress, Reference Department.

President. Report to the Congress on the Mutual Security Program for the Six Months ended December 31, 1954.

United States Information Agency. 3rd Review of Operations, July–December, 1954.

POLITICAL THEORY, RESEARCH, AND METHODOLOGY

Graduate Education and Research in Government in the South: A Report of the Advisory Commission on Graduate Education and Research in Government in the South. (Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board. 1954. Pp. ix, 77.)

The strength of this study, prepared by a distinguished Advisory Commission aided by Lee S. Greene as Study Director, is its review of the many evidences of the dramatic progress of Southern political science and research on government. These evidences include: the doubling, since Robert S. Rankin's 1946 study, of the number of institutions offering graduate work in political science; the rapid growth of bureaus of public administration; the increase of scholarly research and publication in the South (particularly, the reviewer may add, through the admirable *Journal of Politics*, edited by Professor Greene); the outpouring of energies, though sometimes misdirected, on in-service training programs; and the innovative genius displayed in inter-university cooperative arrangments for public administration training, city planning training and research, library specialization, education in foreign affairs, and research on region-wide governmental problems.

The weakness of the study is that the authors are unable to pursue the implications of their premise that the primary problem of graduate training in the South is one of improving the quality, rather than of increasing the number, of existing graduate programs. Thirteen Southern universities have authority to award the Ph.D. degree; forty-two award the M.A. But 59 of the 65 Ph.D.'s awarded in 1947–53 were granted by only five universities—Johns Hopkins and Texas (both barely in "the South" and together accounting for half of the Ph.D.'s), and Duke, North Carolina, and Virginia. Of the 561 M.A.'s, over half were awarded by only ten schools.

The authors do not point out or comment on this concentration, though the data are presented in tables. And, understandably if regrettably, the Advisory Commission's terms of reference precluded discriminating judgments among institutions. But if qualitative improvement is the objective, a generalized formula for all institutions (higher salaries, lighter teaching loads, stronger libraries, academic freedom, better-financed fellowships) evades the basic issue. This is whether building of a few strong, well-balanced political science departments in scholarship-valuing universities that provide supporting strength in the other social sciences might not be a direct and sound regional solution. This issue is not faced. Instead, the authors embrace region-wide committees and inter-university cooperation (with joint use of faculty, exchange of students, and like devices) on the ground that "very few if any universities will be outstanding during any one period in all of the specialized areas of political science." Concentration of resources and cooperative use of scattered resources may be alternatives or may be complementary. Both need to be subjected to critical analysis.—JAMES W. FESLER, *Yale University.*

Henry George. BY CHARLES ALBRO BARKER. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1955. Pp. xvii, 682. $9.50.)

The most striking feature about Professor Barker's *Henry George* is that its author is the first American professional scholar, outside the inner circle of Georgists, to produce a full-length book on this provocative and original contributor to economic and political thought.

Henry George's spirited *Progress and Poverty* may have made at least as much sense as Karl Marx's three-volume obfuscation of a basically simple conception. But George, unlike Marx, did not attach his ideas to the demands of a self-conceived economic class; and for other reasons which are more obscure, the Georgist single tax movement has not swept the world. Nothing fails like lack of success, and so scholarly writing on Henry George has been notable for its scarcity.

Professor Barker, historian at Johns Hopkins University, makes clear that the moral and political influence of Henry George is by no means negligible; and this book comes as a welcome oasis in an academic desert.

Professor Barker's thoroughly objective analysis is more the history of a man than of a set of ideas, though the latter does not suffer in his Chapter X on *Progress and Poverty*, in his concluding chapter on "The Triple Legacy of Georgism," or in several other sections of the biography.

The volume is particularly notable for its constant evidence of ten years of painstaking research which seems to have omitted nothing from the life of Henry George. Professor Barker's proliferation of personal detail will serve well to fill an academic void on Henry George, and will be welcomed by devoted Georgists. The author's remarkable patience in tracing George's influence on many lines of American thought will be useful to students of contemporary political and economic movements.

It is no criticism of such a distinguished scholarship to say that Professor Barker's microscopic analysis may frighten away some readers.—JAMES L. BUSEY, *University of Colorado.*

Progress and Poverty. BY HENRY GEORGE. (New York: Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, 75th Anniversary Edition. 1954 and 1955. Pp. xxiv, 577. De luxe, $5.00; regular cloth, $1.50.)

An American classic, modernized in both typography and format. The new editions subdue George's quaint chapter headings, use a clearer type face than any previous printings, and add a preface on the quiet but surprising progress of Georgism to date. Perhaps the most interesting addition to the new *Progress and Poverty* is a glossary, which elucidates on the many fascinating, sometimes obscure, characters and references which Henry George included in his book.

The Language of Social Research: A Reader in the Methodology of Social Research. EDITED BY PAUL F. LAZARSFELD AND MORRIS ROSENBERG. (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press. 1955. Pp. xiii, 590, $6.75.)

A collection of some 64 readings in methodology, skilfully selected to illustrate a wide range of techniques and problems. Most of the selections are reports of actual empirical studies, and not mere abstract discussions of methodology. Brief but penetrating introductory statements to each of the main selections supply the connective tissue, and the editors also provide useful annotated bibliographies. About a dozen of the readings deal specifically with political phenomena, and almost all will be of interest to political scientists who wish to acquire or improve their techniques of empirical investigation.

Politik und Ethik, Moglichkeiten und Grenzen ihrer Synthese. BY LUDWIG FREUND. (Berlin: Alfred Metzner Verlag. 1955. Pp. xii, 315.)

While considering as unrealistic both the Utopian ideas that politics can be controlled by ethics and the beliefs that politics and ethics do not mix, the author searches for an "empiric answer" to the unavoidable contrast between "the postulates of the absolute morality" on one hand and "the realities of political practicability" on the other.

Having drawn into his discussion practices of various nations as well as a great deal of political thought of others, the author sees the answer to his dilemma in a sort of compromise between "the moral impulses and material interest." Such a modest compromise he thinks attainable in a liberally educated society, mainly as a result of "moral brakes" operative in such a society.

The State versus Socrates: A Case Study in Civic Freedom. EDITED WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY JOHN D. MONTGOMERY. (Boston: The Beacon Press. 1954. Pp. 247. $3.50.)

An interesting collection of writings about Socrates compiled in the belief that the same forces which brought Socrates to trial in 399 B.C. are at work again in twentieth-century America. The symposium includes writings ranging from Plato to Toynbee and includes those of Werner Jaeger, Paul Elmer More, A. E. Taylor, George Grote, Karl R. Popper, and Eduard Zeller.

Problems of Analyzing and Predicting Soviet Behavior. BY JOHN S. RESHETAR, JR. (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co. Inc. 1955. Pp. x, 68, 95¢).

The author lists various approaches used by social scientists in studying Soviet behavior and evaluates their relative merits and limitations.

The Process and Effects of Mass Communication. EDITED BY WILBUR SCHRAMM. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 1954. Pp. 586. $6.00.)

Thirty-eight articles dealing with phases of the process of mass communication with special attention devoted to international communication.

The Year Book of Education, 1954: Education and Technological Development. EDITED BY ROBERT KING HALL, N. HANS, and J. A. LAUWERYS. (New York: World Book Company. 1955. Pp. xiv, 621. $8.00.)

A joint project of Columbia University Teachers College and the University of London Institute of Education, this extremely weighty volume brings together over 60 essays and research papers under the general theme, "Education and Technological Development." Every geographic area, every academic discipline, and every point of view is represented.

Freedom Limited: An Essay on Democracy. BY MARTEN TEN HOOR. (Tuscaloosa, Ala.: University of Alabama Press. 1954. Pp. ix, 220. $3.50.)

A somewhat subjective treatment of the problems of present-day democracy. The four parts deal, respectively, with the ends of democratic government, its machinery, the role of the citizen, and the future outlook for democracy.

Sketch for a Historical Picture of the Progress of the Human Mind. BY ANTOINE-NICOLAS DE CONDORCET. TRANSLATED BY JUNE BARRACLOUGH. INTRODUCTION BY STUART HAMPSHIRE. (New York: The Noonday Press. 1955. Pp. xvi, 202. $3.50.)

The first English translation of Condorcet's last and most important work since a very poor one which appeared anonymously in 1795.

The Rise of French Liberal Thought: A Study of Political Ideas from Bayle to Condorcet. BY KINGSLEY MARTIN. (New York: New York University Press. 1954. Pp. xvii, 311. $3.75.)

The reprinting of a well-known work first published in 1929 with revisions undertaken by J. P. Mayer in collaboration with the author.

American Political Thought. BY ALAN PENDLETON GRIMES. (New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1955. Pp. xi, 500. $4.75.)

A rather brief and somewhat incomplete and uneven treatment of the history of American political thought. The late 19th and the 20th centuries in particular are briefly dealt with. A relatively large amount of space is given to such thinkers as Henry George, Edward Bellamy, Laurence Gronlund, Thorstein Veblen, Daniel De Leon, and Lawrence Dennis.

SELECTED ARTICLES AND DOCUMENTS ON
POLITICAL THEORY

FRANCIS G. WILSON

University of Illinois

History and Criticism

Abad Carretero, Luis. La Obra de Leopoldo Zea. *Cuadernos Americanos.* March-April, 1955.

Albaum, Martin. Moral Defenses of Physiocrats' Laissez-Faire. *Journal of the History of Ideas.* April, 1955.

Bagge, D. Les Idées de Ballanche sur la Parole et l'Écriture comme Facteurs de l'Évolution Politique. *Revue Internationale d'Histoire Politique et Constitutionnelle.* October-December, 1954.

Baratier, P. Extraits du "Note Book" d'Edmund Burke. *Études Anglaises.* January-March, 1955.

Barker, Ernest. Elections in the Ancient World. *Diogenes.* Autumn, 1954.

Beccari, Arturo. Interpretazioni del Rinascimento. *Humanitas.* January, 1955.

Beharriell, Frederick J. Conrad Ferdinand Meyer and the Origins of Psychoanalysis. *Monatshefte.* March, 1955.

Beneyto, Juan. La Política Jurisdiccional y de Orden Público de los Reyes Católicos. *Revista de Estudios Políticos.* September-October, 1954.

Bérard, Léon. Le II^e Centenaire de Montesquieu. *La Revue des Deux Mondes.* May 1, 1955.

Biscione, Michele. Rassegna di Studi Burckhardtiani (IV). *Rassegna di Filosofia.* October-December, 1954.

Boak, A. E. R. *Politai* as Landholders at Karanis in the Time of Diocletian and Constantine. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology.* December, 1954.

Bolaffi, E. La "Dottrina del Buon Governo" Presso i Romani e le Origini del Principato in Roma Fino ad Augustus Compreso. *Latomus.* Junuary-March, 1955.

Chicchiarelli, E. I Tempi di Giannetto e Giannettino. *La Cultura Populare.* January, 1955.

Cotta, S. L'Illuminisme et la Science Politique: Montesquieu, Diderot et Catherine II. *Revue Internationale d'Histoire Politique et Constitutionnelle.* October-December, 1954.

Dawson, Christopher. Toynbee's Study of

History: The Place of Civilizations in History. *International Affairs*. April, 1955.

Dailly, R. and H. Van Effenterre. Le Cas de Marc-Aurèle. Essai de Psychosomatique Historique. *Revue des Études Anciennes*. July-December, 1954.

Daniel-Rops. Ignace de Loyola. *Hommes et Mondes*. April. 1955.

Delgado, Jaime. La Revolución Mejicana. *Estudios Americanos*. November-December, 1954.

Domarchi, Jean. The Decline of the Ancient World. *Diogenes*. Autumn, 1954.

Eyck, F. Gunther. The Political Theories and Activities of the German Academic Youth Between 1815 and 1819. *Journal of Modern History*. March, 1955.

Farrison, W. Edward. Origin of Brown's Clotel [Thomas Jefferson]. *Phylon*. 4th Quarter, 1954.

Ferrer Canales, José. Martí y Puerto Rico. *Cuadernos Americanos*. March-April, 1955.

Frankena, William. Hutcheson's Moral Sense Theory. *Journal of the History of Ideas*. June, 1955.

Frati, Aurelio. Atene e la Sofistica. *Nuova Rivista Storica*. October-December, 1955.

Frisch, Morton J., "The Architecture of American Political Theory," *Ethics*. April, 1955.

Funke, G. Maine de Biran; die Philosophische Begrundung der Just-Milieu Politik. *Historische Zeitschrift*. February, 1955.

Fusilier, R. La Representation Proportionnelle en Suède, de 1909 à 1952. *Revue Internationale d'Histoire Politique et Constitutionnelle*. July-September, 1954.

Garfinkle, Norton. Science and Religion in England, 1790–1800. *Journal of the History of Ideas*. June, 1955.

Gelzer, Matthias. Staat und Bürger im Altertum. *Museum Helveticum*. January, 1955.

Glaesener, H. Quelques Aspects du Type de Cassandre. *Les Études Classiques*. April, 1955.

Hahlweg, Werner. Lenin und Clausewitz (II). *Archiv fur Kulturgeschichte*. 36/3. 1954.

Hare, Richard. A Russian Plebeian of the Reform Period. *Slavonic and East European Review*. December, 1954.

Harris, David. European Liberalism in the Nineteenth Century. *American Historical Review*. April, 1955.

Hepburn, Ronald. George Hakewill: The Virility of Nature. *Journal of the History of Ideas*. April, 1955.

Herberg, Will. The Biblical Basis of American Democracy. *Thought*. Spring, 1955.

Hobsbawm, E. J. The Crisis of the Seventeenth Century (II). *Past and Present*. November, 1954.

Hodgart, M. J. C. In the Shade of the Golden Bough. *Twentieth Century*. February, 1955.

Hoffmann, St. Du "Contrat Social," ou le Mirage de la Volonté Générale. *Revue Internationale d'Histoire Politique et Constitutionnelle*. October-December, 1954.

Howe, Irving. Dostoevsky: The Politics of Salvation. *Kenyon Review*. Winter, 1955.

Kantorwicz, Ernst H. Mysteries of State: An Absolutist Concept and Its Late Medieval Origins. *Harvard Theological Review*. January, 1955.

Kaufman, Walter. Nietzsche and Rilke. *Kenyon Review*. Winter, 1955.

Kruger, Daniel H. Hobson, Lenin, and Schumpeter on Imperialism. *Journal of the History of Ideas*. April, 1955.

Leslie, R. F. Left-Wing Tactics in Poland, 1831–1846. *Slavonic and East European Review*. December, 1954.

Levi, Mario Attilio. Storia Classica e Storia Universale. *Atene e Roma*. May-June, 1952.

Levinson, Ronald B. The Sophists. *Review of Metaphysics*. March, 1955.

Loubere, Leo A. The Evolution of Louis Blanc's Political Philosophy. *Journal of Modern History*. March, 1955.

Lugarini, L. L'Argomento del "Terzo Uomo," e la Critica di Aristotele a Platone. *Acme*. January-April, 1954.

Marcuse, Ludwig. Heine and Marx: A History and a Legend. *Germanic Review*. April, 1955.

Mathur, G. B. Hume, Kant, and Pragmatism. *Journal of the History of Ideas*. April, 1955.

McRae, Kenneth D. Ramist Tendencies in the Thought of Bodin. *Journal of the History of Ideas*. June, 1955.

Michael, Franz. State and Society in Nineteenth-Century China. *World Politics*. April, 1955.

Mondolfo, Rodolfo. Greek Attitude to Manual Labor. *Past and Present*. November, 1954.

Mousnier, Roland. Comment les Français du XVIIᵉ Siècle Voyaient la Constitution. *Bulletin de la Société d'Étude du XVIIᵉ Siècle*. Nos. 25–26, 1955.

Mousnier, Roland. L'Opposition Politique Bourgeoise à la Fin du XVIᵉ siècle et au Debut du XVIIe Siècle. *Revue Historique.* January-March, 1955.

Muranjan, S. K. Some Perspectives on Economic Thought in India. *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly.* March, 1955.

Notestein, Robert B. Moral Rigorism of W. G. Sumner. *Journal of the History of Ideas.* June, 1955.

Olguín, Manuel. La Filosofiá Social de Alfonso Reyes. *Revista Hispánica Moderna.* January, 1955.

Oliver, Revilo P. A Note on the *De Rebus Bellicis. Classical Philology.* April, 1955.

Onimus, J. Les Mauvais Rêves d'Ernest Renan. *Études.* April, 1955.

Otto, Eberhard. Altägyptische Zeitvorstellungen und Zeitbegriffe. *Die Welt als Geschichte.* XIV/3–4. 1954.

Pansini, Giuseppe. Joseph de Maistre e la Democrazia. *Nuova Rivista Storica.* October-December, 1954.

Pipes, Richard. Max Weber and Russia. *World Politics.* April, 1955.

Pittet, Armaud. Le Mot Consensus chez Sénèque, Ses Acceptions Philosophique et Politique. *Museum Helveticum.* January, 1955.

Plank, Robert. Historical Illustrations of Concept Formation. *Etc.* Winter, 1955.

Ponteil, F. Le Regime Autoritaire et les Grandes Lois Organiques de l'An VIII. *Revue Internationale d'Histoire Politique et Constitutionnelle.* July-September, 1954.

Pratt, R. Crawford. The Benthamite Theory of Democracy. *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science.* February, 1955.

Ravinel, P. de. Cicéron est-il un Bavard? *Les Études Classiques.* January, 1955.

Reardon, B. M. G. Roman Catholic Modernism: A Retrospect. *Quarterly Review.* April, 1955.

Rosenthal, Jerome. Voltaire's Philosophy of History. *Journal of the History of Ideas.* April, 1955.

Russo, Luigi. Lorenzo il Magnifico. *Belfagor.* January, 1955.

Sampson, R. V. Lincoln Steffens: An Interpretation. *Western Political Quarterly.* March 1955.

Sasso, Gennaro. Noterella Guicciardiniana. *Rassegna di Filosofia.* October-December, 1954.

Schuschnigg, Kurt von. The Last Years of the Pre-War Austrian State. *Social Order.* May, 1955.

Simkins, Francis B. Tolerating the South's Past. *Journal of Southern History.* February, 1955.

Smith, Ferrer. A Thomistic Appraisal of the Philosophy of John Dewey. *Thomist.* April, 1955.

Spence, Robert. D. A. Wasson, Forgotten Transcendentalist. *American Literature.* March, 1955.

Spengler, Joseph J. Aristotle on Economic Imputation and Related Matters. *Southern Economic Journal.* April, 1955.

Starr, Chester G. Virgil's Acceptance of Octavian. *American Journal of Philology.* January, 1955.

Strong, E. W. Whewell *vs.* J. S. Mill on Science. *Journal of the History of Ideas.* April, 1955.

Taylor, F. Sherwood. St. Albert the Great. *Month.* April, 1955.

Thomas, J. Heywood. The Christology of Søren Kierkegaard and Karl Barth. *Hibbert Journal.* April, 1955.

Tuveson, Ernest. Locke and the "Dissolution of the Ego." *Modern Philology.* February, 1955.

Voitle, Robert B. Shaftsbury's Moral Sense. *Studies in Philology.* January, 1955.

Warlomont, R. La Representation Économique dans l'Acte Additionel aux Constitutions de l'Empire. *Revue Internationale d'Histoire Politique et Constitutionelle.* July-September, 1954.

Watkins, J. W. N. Philosophy and Politics in Hobbes. *Philosophical Quarterly.* April, 1955.

Watt, W. Montgomery. Carlyle on Muhammad. *Hibbert Journal.* April, 1955.

Weinberg, Bernard. La "Methode Scientifique" et les Insuffisances de la Critique Littéraire au Dix-Neuvième Siècle. *Revista di Letteratura Moderna.* October-December, 1954.

Welter, Rush. The Idea of Progress in America. *Journal of the History of Ideas.* June, 1955.

Wilkinson, B. English Politics and Politicians of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries. *Speculum.* January, 1955.

Williamson, Chilton. Rhode Island Suffrage since the Dorr War. *New England Quarterly.* March, 1955.

Legal Theory and Public Law Issues

Beth, Loren P. The Case for Judicial Protection of Civil Liberties. *Journal of Politics.* February, 1955.

Brown, Stuart M. Inalienable Rights. *Philosophical Review.* April, 1955.

Claughton, R. The Copyright Tyranny.

American Journal of Economics and Sociology. April, 1955.

Codification [Various Articles.] *Tulane Law Review.* February, 1955.

Communism. The Communist Control Act of 1954. *Yale Law Journal.* April, 1955.

Cowan, Zelman. A Comparison of the Constitutions of Australia and the United States. *Buffalo Law Review.* Winter, 1955.

Dixon, Robert G. The Doctrine of the Separation of Powers and the Federal Immunity Statutes. *George Washington Law Review.* April, 1955.

Farram, C. d'O. The Sovereign Order of Malta in International Law. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly.* April, 1954.

Frankena, W. K. Natural and Inalienable Rights. *Philosophical Review.* April, 1955.

Friedmann, W. Monopoly, Reasonableness, and Public Interest. *Canadian Bar Review.* February, 1955.

Goble, George W. Nature, Man and Law: The True Natural Law. *American Bar Association Journal.* May, 1955.

Goldschmidt, Werner. El Estado de Necesidad ante el Derecho Natural. *Revista de Estudios Politicos.* November-December, 1954.

Hart, H. L. A. Are there Any Natural Rights? *Philosophical Review.* April, 1955.

Hesse, A. Conception Américaine et Conception Française des Declarations de Droits. *Revue Internationale d'Histoire Politique et Constitutionnelle.* October-December, 1954.

Hirt, F. Du Droit de la Force Publique. *Revue du Droit Public et de la Science Politique.* October-December, 1954.

Hogan, John C. Joseph Story's Anonymous Law Articles. *Michigan Law Review.* April, 1954.

Hogan, John C. Joseph Story's Essay on 'Natural Law.' *Oregon Law Review.* February, 1955.

Hogan, John C. Joseph Story on Capital Punishment. *California Law Review.* March, 1955.

Hogan, John C. Three Essays on the Law by Joseph Story. *Southern California Law Review.* December, 1954.

Insanity and the Criminal Law. [Various Articles.] *University of Chicago Law Review* Winter, 1955.

Johnson, E. L. Aspects of the Soviet Legal System. *Soviet Studies.* April, 1955.

Larson, Arthur. The Lawyer as Conservative. *Cornell Law Quarterly.* Winter, 1955.

Lavau, Georges E. Valeur Presente de la Souveraineté des États. *Esprit.* March, 1955.

L'Huillier, Jean. Défense du Positivisme Juridique. *Revue du Droit Public et de la Science Politique.* October-December, 1954.

Loewenstein, Karl. Souveränität und Zwischenstaatliche Zusammenarbeit. *Archiv für Offentlichen Rechts.* 80/1–2. 1955.

Mossa, Lorenzo. Il Punto Critico della Giurisprudenza. *Nuova Rivista di Diritto Commerciale.* VII/10–12. 1954.

Mossa, Lorenzo. Morale e Diritto nella Società Socialista. *Nuova Rivista di Diritto Commerciale.* VII/10-12. 1954.

Pound, Roscoe. The French Civil Code and the Spirit of Nineteenth Century Law. *Boston University Law Review.* January, 1955.

Sayre, Paul. An Ethical Approach to Legal Philosophy. *Journal of Legal Education.* 7/3. 1955.

Schwenk, Edmund H. Highlights of a Comparative Study of Common and Civil Law Countries. *North Carolina Law Review.* April 1955.

Sciacca, Michele Federico. Concepto de la Propiedad. *Revista de Estudios Politicos.* September-October, 1954.

Westin, Alan F. A Critique of Civil Libertarian Reactions to the "Communist Problem." *Northwestern University Law Review.* March-April, 1955.

Wyzanski, C. E. Process and Pattern: The Search for Standards in the Law. *Indiana Law Journal.* Winter, 1955.

Special Studies and Analysis

Abbagnano, Nicola. Morti o Transfigurazione dell' Esistenzialismo. *Nuovi Argomenti.* January-February, 1955.

Adams, James Luther. Religion and the Ideologies. *Confluence.* April, 1955.

Agorio, Adolfo. Glossario Vivo de Miguel de Unamuno. *Bolivar.* March, 1955.

Alderson, Stanley. Prescription for Democracy. *Quarterly Review.* April, 1955.

Armstrong, John P. The Enigma of Senator Taft and American Foreign Policy. *Review of Politics.* April, 1955.

Arnold, G. L. Collectivism Reconsidered. *British Journal of Sociology.* March, 1955.

Aron, Raymond. Les Intellectuels et l'Utopie. *Preuves.* April, 1955.

Attlee, Clement. Weltkonflickt und Koexistenz. *Dokumente.* February, 1955.

Balladur, Jean. Urbanisme et Democratie. *Les Temps Modernes.* April, 1955.

Becarud, J. L'Église et les Libertés en Espagne. *La Vie Intellectuelle.* April, 1955.

Bollnow, O. F. Die Tugend der Hoffnung—Eine Auseinandersetzung mit dem Existentialismus. *Universitas.* February, 1955.

Borkenau, Franz. The Concept of Death. *Twentieth Century.* April, 1955.

Borkenau, Franz. Toynbee's Judgment of the Jews. *Commentary.* May, 1955.

Bronfenbrenner, Martin. Two Concepts of Economic Freedom. *Ethics.* April, 1955.

Brucculeri, A. Il Liberalismo Economico e la Morale Cattolica. *La Civiltà Cattolica.* 19 March 1955.

Brüning, W. Das Bild des Menschen im Objektiven Idealismus. *Kant-Studien.* 46/4 1954–55.

Bunzel, John A. The General Ideology of American Small Business. *Political Science Quarterly.* March, 1955.

Carrington, C. E. A New Theory of the Commonwealth. *International Affairs.* April, 1955.

Carro Martinez, Antonio. La Médula del Sistema de Poder en el Estado Contemporanéo: La Burocracia. *Revista de Estudios Políticos.* September-October, 1954.

Castro, Emanuele di. Rassegna di Studi sul concetto di Persona. *Rassegna di Filosofia.* October-December, 1954.

Corf, Walter. Existentialist Mannerism and Education. *Journal of Philosophy.* March 17, 1955.

Cogniot, Georges. "L'Origine de la Famille, de la Proprieté Privée et de l'État," de F. Engels. *Cahiers du Communisme.* May, 1955.

Dahl, Robert A. The Science of Politics: New and Old. *World Politics.* April, 1955.

Daya. Surplus Value, Profit and Exploitation—An Attempt at an Analysis of Some Concepts in Marxian Economy. *Review of Economic Studies.* XXII/58. 1954–55.

De Gasperi, Alcide. [Various Articles]. *Civitas.* December, 1954.

Derathé, Robert. Les Deux Conceptions de l'Histoire chez Arnold J. Toynbee. *Revue Française de Science Politique.* January-March, 1955.

Desanti, J.-T. Sur Quelques Problèmes Concernant la Base et la Superstructure. *Cahiers du Communisme.* March, 1955.

Dettering, Richard W. Conformity in Democratic Education. *Journal of Higher Education.* March, 1955.

Domenach, Jean-Marie. Les Nationalismes et le Dépassement des Nations. *Esprit.* March, 1955.

Drzymalla, Georg. Freedom and Authority. *Diogenes.* Autumn, 1954.

Duméry, H. Critique et Religion. *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale.* October-December, 1955.

Easton, David. Social Science and Values. *Antioch Review.* Spring, 1955.

Feuer, Lewis S. Political Myths and Metaphysics. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research.* March, 1955.

Freyer, Hans. Die Vollendbarkeit der Geschichte. *Merkur.* February, 1955.

Friedrich, Carl J. Religion and History. *Confluence.* April, 1955.

Frutos, Eugenio. Idealismo y Realismo en Politica. *Revista de Estudios Políticos.* November-December, 1954.

Fueyo Alvarez, Jesús F. Genealogía del Sociologismo. *Revista de Estudios Políticos.* September-October, 1954.

Garaudy, Roger. La Social-Démocratie et le Front Unique. *Cahiers du Communisme.* April. 1955.

García, Manuel Alonzo. La Clase Media y su Significación. *Arbor.* March, 1955.

Glum, Friedrich. Politische Erziehung. *International Review of Education.* 1/2. 1955.

Goguel, François. Pourquoi les Français Votent comme ils le Font. *French Review.* February, 1955.

Gómez Molleda, Mariá Dolores. España en Europa. Utopía y Realismo de Una Política. *Arbor.* February, 1955.

Guttenberg, A. C. de. Europas Geist und Amerikas Geist. *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik.* March, 1955.

Hacker, Frederick. Psychiatry and Religion. *Journal of Religion.* April, 1955.

Herberg, Will. Communism, Democracy, and the Churches. *Commentary.* April, 1955.

Hilferding, Rudolf. Das Historische Problem. *Zeitschrift für Politik.* 1/4. 1954.

Hill, F. G. Economic Theory, Value Judgments, and Economic Policy. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology.* April, 1955.

Hours, Joseph. Les Catholiques Français et la Patrie. *L'Année Politique et Économique.* January-March, 1955.

Huxley, Julian. Ma Conception de l'Histoire. *Hommes et Mondes.* April, 1955.

Jordan, Elijah. The Philosophical Problem of Religion. *Ethics.* April, 1955.

Jouvenal, Bertrand de. Du Groupe. *Revue Française de Science Politique.* January-March. 1955.

Kallen, Horace M. The Comic Spirit in the

Freedom of Man. *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism.* March, 1955.

Kelman, Norman. Psychoanalysis and Morality. *American Scholar.* Spring, 1955.

Key, V. O. A Theory of Critical Elections. *Journal of Politics.* February, 1955.

Kirk, Russell. King Demos: The Meaning of Democracy. *Month.* April, 1955.

Kirk, Russell. The Path to Utopia. *Southwest Review.* Spring, 1955.

Kuchnelt-Leddihn, Erik von. America's Myths of Europe. *Southwest Review.* Spring, 1955.

Kuchnelt-Leddihn, Erik von. The New Conservatism in Europe. *Southwest Review.* Winter, 1955.

Kuznets, Simon. Economic Growth and Income Inequality. *American Economic Review.* March, 1955.

Langbaum, Robert. Totalitarianism: A New Disease of Modernism. *Commentary.* May, 1955.

Lawrence, Nathaniel. Natural Right and Human Nature. *Review of Metaphysics.* March, 1955.

Le Henaff, Armand. L'Erreur Keynesienne. *Revue Politique et Parlementaire.* March, 1955.

Lindbergh, Charles A. Das Dilemma des Modernen Menschen. *Universitas.* February, 1955.

Lipsky, George A. The Theory of International Relations of Harold D. Lasswell. *Journal of Politics.* February, 1955.

Loda, Natale. La Divergenza Odierna sul Marxismo (III). *Rassegna di Filosofia.* October-December, 1954.

Löwith, Karl. Schöpfung und Existenz. *Merkur.* March, 1955.

Macbeth, A. The Need for a Social Philosophy. *Philosophy.* April, 1955.

Magid, Henry M. A Critique of Easton on the Moral Foundations of Theoretical Research in Political Science. *Ethics.* April, 1955.

Marcel, Gabriel. Der Mensch: Eine Frage für den Menschen. *Dokumente.* February, 1955.

Mayer, Charles. De la Sensation à la Pensée. *La Revue Liberale.* April, 1955.

Mendras, Henri. Cities and Countryside. *Diogenes.* Autumn, 1954.

Mitscherlich, Alexander. Grossstadt und Neurose. *Merkur,* March, 1955.

Moulin, Léo. Les Formes du Gouvernement Local et Provincial dans les Instituts Religieux. *Revue Internationale des Sciences Administratives.* 21/1. 1955.

Ollero, Carlos. Ciencia Política y Sociología. *Revista de Estudios Políticos.* September-October, 1954.

Parker, W. M. Professor Toynbee's "Magnum Opus." *Quarterly Review.* April, 1955.

Pozzo, Gianni M. Per una Soluzione Cristiana del Dramma Esistenziale. *Humanitas.* January, 1955.

Preti, G. Materialismo Storico e Teoria dell'Evoluzione. *Rivista di Filosofia.* January, 1955.

Record, Wilson. The American Intellectual as Black Sheep and Red Rover. A.A.U.P. *Bulletin.* Winter, 1954–55.

Religion, Sociological Study. [Various Articles.] *American Journal of Sociology.* May, 1955.

Rivero, Jean. L'État Liberal et la Démocratie Gouvernée. *Revue Française de Science Politique.* January-March, 1955.

Robbins, Lionel. Schumpeter's History of Economic Analysis. *Quarterly Journal of Economics.* February, 1955.

Rosenman, Stanley. The Witch Hunter. *Psychoanalysis.* Fall, 1954.

Rossiter, Clinton. Toward an American Conservatism. *Yale Review.* March, 1955.

Rougier, Louis. Pourquoi les Français sont-ils Ingouvernables? *La Revue des Deux Mondes.* April 15, 1955.

Ruyssen, T. Le Désarroi Actuel de la Théologie Chrétienne. *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale.* October-December, 1954.

Salleron, Louis. Económica y Corporación. *Cuadernos de Política Social.* No. 24, 1954.

Sauvy, Alfred. La Révolte des Propriétaires. *Esprit.* April, 1955.

Schatzman, Evry. Le Combat contre l'Idealisme en Physique. *Cahiers du Communisme.* February, 1955.

Schmitt, Carl. Coloquio sobre el Poder y sobre el Acceso al Poderoso. *Revista de Estudios Políticos.* November-December, 1954.

Scott, J. H. M. Liberalism and Democracy. *Contemporary Review.* February, 1955.

Scott, K. J. The Political Theory of the Social Service State. *New Zealand Journal of Public Administration.* September, 1954.

Severi, Francisco. Assoluto e Relativo. *Nuova Antologia.* March, 1955.

Shils, Edward. The British Intellectuals. *Encounter.* April, 1955.

Socialism in Europe. [Various Articles.] *Dokumente.* April, 1955.

South and the Negro. [Various Articles.] *Virginia Quarterly Review.* Spring, 1955.

Sperling, Otto. E. A Psychoanalytic Study of Social-Mindedness. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*. April, 1955.

Tannenbaum, Frank. The Future of Democracy in Latin America. *Foreign Affairs*. April, 1955.

Taubes, Jacob. On the Symbolic Order of Modern Democracy. *Confluence*. April, 1955.

Taubes, Jacob. Theology and Political Theory. *Social Research*. Spring, 1955.

Thompson, Kenneth W. Beyond National Interest: A Critical Evaluation of Reinhold Niebuhr's Theory of International Relations. *Review of Politics*. April, 1955.

Todd, John H. Just Wars and Christian Peace. *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*. January, 1955.

Toynbee, Arnold J. A Business School of Intellectual Action. *Chicago Review*. Spring, 1955.

Vecchio, Giorgio del. Dantes Weltpolitisches Konzeption und Unsere Zeit. *Universitas*. April, 1955.

Wagner, Geoffrey. Wyndham Lewis and Bergson. *Romanic Review*. April, 1955.

Wallace, Karl R. Rhetoric and Politics. *Southern Journal of Speech*. Spring, 1955.

Wandycz, Piotr S. The Theory of International Relations. *Review of Politics*. April, 1955.

Weigel, Gustave. Ecumenicism and the Catholic. *Thought*. Spring, 1955.

White, Howard B. The Loyalty Oath. *Social Research*. Spring, 1955.

Wiese, Leopold Von. Die Leitenden Eliten. *Universitas*. March, 1955.

Winter, P. J. Van. De Apartheids-Politiek in Zuid-Afrika. *De Gids*. April, 1955.

Zalba, Marcellino. Inquietudes, Metodológicas en Teología Moral. *Arbor*. March, 1955.

SELECTED ARTICLES AND DOCUMENTS ON

METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

HERBERT A. SIMON

Carnegie Institute of Technology

Philosophy of Social Science

Bar-Hillel, Yehoshua. An Examination of Information Theory. *Philosophy of Science*. April, 1955.

Bredemeier, Harry C. The Methodology of Functionalism. *American Sociological Review*. April, 1955.

de Finetti, Bruno. Probability and the Social Sciences. *International Social Science Bulletin*. 1954, #4.

Driscoll, Jean M. and Hyneman, Charles S. Methodology for Political Scientists: Perspectives for Study. *American Political Science Review*. March, 1955.

Festinger, Leon. The Relevance of Mathematics to Controlled Experimentation in Sociology. *International Social Science Bulletin*. 1954, #4.

Gordon, Donald F. Operational Propositions in Economic Theory. *Journal of Political Economy*. April, 1955.

Levi-Strauss, Cl. The Mathematics of Man. *International Social Science Bulletin*. 1954, #4.

Magid, Henry M. A Critique of Easton on the Moral Foundation of Theoretical Research in Political Science. *Ethics*. April, 1955.

Oppenheim, Felix E. Interpersonal Freedom and Freedom of Action. *American Political Science Review*. June, 1955.

Simon, Herbert A. Bandwagon and Underdog Effects and the Possibility of Election Predictions. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. Fall, 1954.

Research Methods and Organization

Abelson, Robert P. A Technique and a Model for Multi-Dimensional Attitude Scaling. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. Winter 1954–55.

Blackwell, Gordon W. Multidisciplinary Team Research. *Social Forces*. May, 1955.

Duncan, Otis Dudley, and Duncan, Beverly. A Methodological Analysis of Segregation Indexes. *American Sociological Review*. April, 1955.

Gullahorn, John and Strauss, George. The Field Worker in Union Research. *Human Organization*. Fall, 1954.

Larsen, Otto N. and DeFleur, Melvin L. Validity and Reliability in Measurements of Message Diffusion. Research Studies of the State College of Washington. June, 1955.

Melbin, Murray. An Interaction Recording Device for Participant Observers. *Human Organization*. Summer, 1954.

Miller, Delbert C. The Shaping of Research Design in Large-Scale Group Research. *Social Forces*. May, 1955.

Olmstead, Joseph A. and Blake, Robert R.

The Use of Simulated Groups to Produce Modifications in Judgment. *Journal of Personality.* March, 1955.

Ray, Wilbert S. Complex Tasks for Use in Human Problem-Solving Research. *Psychological Bulletin.* March, 1955.

Sjoberg, Gideon. The Comparative Method in the Social Sciences. *Philosophy of Science.* April, 1955.

Social Science Research Council, Committee on Mathematical Training of Social Scientists. Recommended Policies for the Mathematical Training of Social Scientists. *Items.* June, 1955.

Wohl, R.Richard. Some Observations on the Social Organization of Interdisciplinary Social Science Research. *Social Forces.* May, 1955.

Motivation and Personality

Gordon, Oakley J. A Factor Analysis of Human Needs and Industrial Morale. *Personnel Psychology.* Spring, 1955.

Hickman, C. Addison. Managerial Motivation and the Theory of the Firm. *American Economic Review Proceedings.* May, 1955.

McArthur, Charles. Personality Differences Between Middle and Upper Classes. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology.* March, 1955.

Morse, Nancy C. and Weiss, Robert S. The Function and Meaning of Work and the Job. *American Sociological Review.* April, 1955.

Pearl, David. Psychotherapy and Ethnocentrism. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology.* March, 1955.

Ricciuti, H. N. Ratings of Leadership Potential at the U. S. Naval Academy and Subsequent Officer Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology.* June, 1955.

Rosenbaum, Milton and Blake, Robert R. Volunteering as a Function of Field Structure. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology.* March, 1955.

Rosenberg, Morris. Some Determinants of Political Apathy. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Winter 1954–55.

Opinions and Attitudes

Becker, Sam L. Why an Order Effect. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Fall, 1954.

Borgatta, Edgar F. Attitudinal Concomitants to Military Statuses. *Social Forces.* May, 1955.

Bush, Henry C. The United Nations as a Norm in British Opinion. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Winter, 1954–55.

Congressional Use of Polls: A Symposium. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Summer, 1954.

Haer, John L. Opinions on an Issue in Relation to Selected "Background" Factors. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Summer, 1954.

Handlon, Britomar J. and Squier, Leslie H. Attitudes Toward Special Loyalty Oaths at the University of California. *American Psychologist.* March, 1955.

Elfin, Mel and Zweig, Leonard. The Battle of Political Symbols. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Summer, 1954.

Fallers, Lloyd A. A Note on the "Trickle Effect." *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Fall, 1954.

Kercher, Leonard C.; Hightower, Raymond L.; and Bennett, Samuel V. Taking the Public Pulse on Municipal Services. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Fall, 1954.

Mason, Ward S. and Gross, Neal. Intra-Occupational Prestige Differentiation: the School Superintendency. *American Sociological Review.* June, 1955.

Prothro, E. Terry. Studies in Stereotypes: V. Familiarity and the Kernel of Truth Hypothesis. *Journal of Social Psychology.* February, 1955.

Ringer, Benjamin J. and Glock, Charles Y. The Political Role of the Church as Defined by its Parishioners. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Winter, 1954–55.

Smith, M. Brewster. Comment on the "Implications of Separating Opinions from Attitudes." *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Fall, 1954.

Terrien, Frederic W. Who Thinks What About Education. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Summer, 1954.

Thionet, P. Mathematical Methods in Public Opinion Polls. *International Social Science Bulletin.* 1954. #4.

Zajonc, Robert B. Some Effects of the "Space" Serials. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Winter, 1954–55.

Group Behavior, General

Ausubel, David P. Sociempathy as a Function of Sociometric Status in an Adolescent Group. *Human Relations.* 1955, #1.

Blake, Robert R.; Rosenbaum, Milton; and Duryea, Richard A. Gift-Giving as a Function of Group Standards. *Human Relations.* 1955, #1.

Breed, Warren. Social Control in the Newsroom: A Functional Analysis. *Social Forces.* May, 1955.

Cherry, Colin. On the Mathematics of Social Communications. *International Social Science Bulletin.* 1954, #4.

Christner, Charlotte A. and Hemphill,

John K. Leader Behavior of B-29 Commanders and Changes in Crew Members' Attitudes Toward the Crew. *Sociometry.* February, 1955.

Gronlund, Norman E. Acquaintance Span and Sociometric Status. *Sociometry.* February, 1955.

Hall, Robert L. Social Influence on the Aircraft Commander's Role. *American Sociological Review.* June, 1955.

Halpin, Andrew W. The Leader Behavior and Leadership Ideology of Educational Administrators and Aircraft Commanders. *Harvard Educational Review.* Winter, 1955.

Hollander, E. P. and Webb, Wilse B. Leadership, Followership and Friendship. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology.* March, 1955.

Kaplan, Max. Telopractice: A Symphony Orchestra as it Prepares for a Concert. *Social Forces.* May, 1955.

Lanzetta, John. Group Behavior Under Stress. *Human Relations.* 1955, #1.

Leavitt, Harold J. Small Groups in Large Organization. *Journal of Business.* January, 1955.

Lorge, Irving; Tuckman, Jacob; Aikman, Louis; Spriegel, Joseph; and Moss, Gilda. Problem-Solving by Teams and by Individuals in a Field Setting. *Journal of Educational Psychology.* March, 1955.

Lorge, Irving and Solomon, Herbert. Two Models of Group Behavior in the Solution of Eureka-Type Problems. *Psychometrika.* June, 1955.

March, James G. An Introduction to the Theory and Measurement of Influence. *American Political Science Review.* June, 1955.

March, James G. Group Autonomy and Internal Group Control. *Social Forces.* May, 1955.

Medalia, Nahum Z., and Miller, Delbert C. Human Relations Leadership in Workgroups. *Social Forces.* May, 1955.

Muldoon, John F. The Concentration of Liked and Disliked Members in Groups and the Relationship of the Concentrations to Group Cohesiveness. *Sociometry.* February, 1955.

Rosen, Bernard C. Conflicting Group Membership: A Study of Parent-Peer Group Cross-Pressures. *American Sociological Review.* April, 1955.

Rubin-Rabson, Grace. Liberalism Toward Negroes as a Deviant Reaction in a Conservative Group. *Journal of Social Psychology.* February, 1955.

Schachter, Stanley and Burdick, Harvey. A Field Experiment on Rumor Transmission and Distortion. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology.* May, 1955.

Slater, Philip. Role Differentiation in Small Groups. *American Sociological Review.* June, 1955.

Organizational Behavior

Argyris, Chris. Organizational Leadership and Participative Management. *Journal of Business.* January, 1955.

Chapin, F. Stuart and Tsouderos, John E. Formalization Observed in Ten Voluntary Associations. *Social Forces.* May, 1955.

Comrey, Andrew L.; High, Wallace; and Wilson, Robert C. Factors Influencing Organizational Effectiveness VI. A Survey of Aircraft Workers. *Personnel Psychology.* Spring, 1955.

Dornbusch, Sanford M. The Military Academy as an Assimilating Institution. *Social Forces.* May, 1955.

Hattery, Lowell H.; and Hofheimer, Susan. The Legislators' Source of Expert Information. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Fall, 1954.

MacRae, Duncan, Jr. Some Underlying Variables in Legislative Roll Call Votes. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Summer, 1954.

Marschak, J. Elements for a Theory of Teams. *Management Science.* January, 1955.

Meyer, Poul. Staff and Line. *Revue Internationale des Sciences Administratives.* 1955, #1.

Penrose, Edith. Limits to the Growth and Size of Firms. *American Economic Review Proceedings.* May, 1955.

Silverman, Corrine. The Legislators' View of the Legislative Process. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Summer, 1954.

Tsouderos, John E. Organizational Change in Terms of a Series of Selected Variables. *American Sociological Review.* April, 1955.

Voting Behavior

Eulau, Heinz. Perceptions of Class and Party in Voting Behavior: 1952. *American Political Science Review.* June, 1955.

Fuchs, Lawrence H. American Jews and the Presidential Vote. *American Political Science Review.* June, 1955.

Key, V. O., Jr. A Theory of Critical Elections. *Journal of Politics.* February, 1955.

Lane, Robert E. Political Personality and Electoral Choice. *American Political Science Review.* March, 1955.

MacRae, Duncan, Jr. Occupations and the

Congressional Vote, 1940–1950. *American Sociological Review.* June, 1955.

Pollock, James K. The West German Electoral Law of 1953. *American Political Science Review.* March, 1955.

Price, Hugh Douglas. The Negro and Florida Politics, 1944–1954. *Journal of Politics.* May, 1955.

Simon, Herbert A. and Stern, Frederick. The Effect of Television upon Voting Behavior in Iowa in the 1952 Presidential Election. *American Political Science Review.* June, 1955.

Smith, Howard R. and Hart, John Fraser. The American Tariff Map. *The Geographical Review.* July, 1955.

Tucker, William P. Characteristics of State Legislators. *Social Science.* April, 1955.

Culture and Institutions

Adams, Stuart. Real and Nominal Origins of Selected Occupational Elites. Research Studies of the State College of Washington. June, 1955.

Anderson, Theodore R. Intermetropolitan Migration: A Comparison of the Hypotheses of Zipf and Stouffer. *American Sociological Review.* June, 1955.

Case, Herman M. Marxian Implications of Centers' Interest Group Theory: A Critical Appraisal. *Social Forces.* March, 1955.

Chinoy, Ely. Social Mobility Trends in the United States. *American Sociological Review.* April, 1955.

Conrad, Richard. Social Images in East and West Germany. *Social Forces.* March, 1955.

Davison, W. Phillips. A Review of Sven Rydenfelt's *Communism in Sweden. Public Opinion Quarterly.* Winter 1954–55.

Duncan, Otis Dudley and Duncan, Beverly. Residential Distribution and Occupational Stratification. *American Journal of Sociology.* March, 1955.

Kahl, Joseph A. and Davis, James A. A Comparison of Indexes of Socio-Economic Status. *American Sociological Review.* June, 1955.

Lipset, Seymour M. and Malm, F. Theodore. First Jobs and Career Patterns. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology.* April, 1955.

McConnell, Campbell R. Institutional Economics and Trade Union Behavior. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review.* April, 1955.

McElrath, Dennis C. Prestige and Esteem Identification in Selected Urban Areas. Research Studies of the State College of Washington. June, 1955.

Miller, Walter B. Two Concepts of Authority. *American Anthropologist.* April, 1955.

Monchaux, Cecily de and Shimmin, Sylvia. Some Problems of Method in Experimental Group Psychology: Considerations Arising from Cross-Cultural Experiments on Threat and Rejection. *Human Relations.* 1955, #1.

Research Approaches to the Study of War and Peace. *Journal of Social Issues.* 1955, #1 (whole issue).

Wardwell, Walter I. Social Integration, Bureaucratization, and the Professions. *Social Forces.* May, 1955.

Zimmer, Basil G. Participation of Migrants in Urban Structures. *American Sociological Review.* April, 1955.

Value Theory and Social Policy

Hines, L. G. Economics and the Public Interest. *Land Economics.* May, 1955.

Kemp, Murray C. The Efficiency of Competition as an Allocator of Resources: II. External Economies of Consumption. *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science.* May, 1955.

Rogow, Arnold A. Taxation and "Fair Shares" Under the Labour Government. *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science.* May, 1955.

Villard, Henry H. Some Notes on Population and Living Levels. *Review of Economics and Statistics.* May, 1955.

NEWS AND NOTES

PROFESSIONAL CONFERENCES

The 1954–55 annual meeting of the New England Political Science Association was held on May 7, 1955 at Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts. The morning program included addresses by Victor Jones, Wesleyan University, and Roy Pierce, Smith College, on "The Introductory Course: New Approaches to an Old Problem." At the afternoon session, Louis Hartz, Harvard University, spoke on "The Need for an American Enlightenment." Cecilia Kenyon, Smith College, and Earl Latham, Amherst College, served as panelists. At the business meeting, the following officers were elected for the coming year. Robert K. Carr, Dartmouth College, president; Athern Daggett, Bowdoin College, vice-president; and George Goodwin, Jr., University of Massachusetts, secretary-treasurer. Elected to the executive committee were Marjorie R. Dilley, Connecticut College; Guy Dodge, Brown University; and Robert Lane, Yale University.

The Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the Midwest Conference of Political Scientists was held May 5–7, 1955 at Purdue University with 240 persons in attendance. Featured speakers were Herman Finer, whose topic was "Teaching Political Science by Television," K. C. Wu, who spoke on "Communism in Asia," and E. M. Kirkpatrick, executive director of the American Political Science Association, who reported on the work and aims of the association. Round-table discussions were conducted on the following topics: "Military-Strategic Aspects of Foreign Policy," "The Politics of Agriculture," "Urban Problems," "The Political Science Program in the Small College," "Intergovernmental Relations," and "Producing Political Scientists to Teach in the Liberal Arts College." A general session was also held on the topic "The Political Scientist as Practitioner."

The officers elected by the conference for 1955–1956 were: David Fellman, University of Wisconsin, president; Roy Sherman, University of Akron, vice-president; Charles Hyneman, Northwestern University, and Marbury B. Ogle, Purdue University, members of the Executive Council for three-year terms.

The 1956 meeting of the conference will be held at Marquette University on May 3–5. Program suggestions may be sent to the program chairman, Alfred Hotz, Western Reserve University. General inquiries should be addressed to the secretary-treasurer, LeRoy Bennett, Drake University.

The Northern California Political Science Association held its annual meeting on April 23, 1955 at the City College of San Francisco. Papers were delivered and discussions held on "The Crisis in the Far East," "Campaign Finances in California," "Politics and Ethics in the Time of Crisis," and "Problems of Metropolitan Growth." Professor Harold D. Lasswell, president-elect of the American Political Science Association, addressed the luncheon session on "Recent Advances in the Study of Decisions." Officers elected for 1955–1956 were: president, Dean R. Cresap, San Jose State College; vice-president, Arnaud B. Leavelle, Stanford University; secretary-treasurer, Richard J. Roberts, University of Santa Clara. The following were named members of the council: Charles Lohmyer, San Francisco Naval Shipyard; John McLaughlin, California State Personnel Board; John M. Selig, City College of San Francisco; Norman Jacobson, University of California (Berkeley); Yale Maxon, Oakland Junior College; Hyman Palais, Humboldt State College; and Vernon Puryear, University of California (Davis).

At the summer meeting of the Southern California Political Science Association, held July 15, 1955 on the Los Angeles State College campus, Henry Reining, Jr., Dean of the School of Public Administration, University of Southern California, addressed the group on "Exporting American Ideas and Techniques in Government." Inducted into office for the 1955–56 year were: Robert Moreland, University of Redlands, president; Tully E. Warren, Los Angeles State College, secretary-treasurer; and Frank M. Stewart, University of California (Los Angeles), Totten W. Anderson, University of Southern California, John A. Vieg, Pomona College, Don B. Leiffer, San Diego State College, and Arthur C. Turner, University of California at Riverside, directors.

The District of Columbia Political Science

Association and the Washington Chapter of the Industrial Relations Research Association held a joint Conference on Personnel Security Programs in United States Industry on June 3, 1955 at the Willard Hotel. The purpose of the conference, which was attended by more than 200 people, was to explore the impact and the meaning of the loyalty and security programs which cover civilian workers.

The Florida Citizenship Clearing House, the only citizenship clearing house in the South, completed its first year's program with a Conference on State Government, April 25–27, 1955 at the Florida State University, Tallahassee. Seventy-five students from Florida universities and colleges heard key officials and legislators during the three days of panel discussions and observation of the legislature and of action in the executive branch. Principal speakers included House Speaker Ted Davis, former Speaker Farris Bryant, and former Governor M. F. Caldwell. The Florida Citizenship Clearing House is financed by grants from the Falk Foundation and local supporters.

The Fifth Annual Meeting of the Conference of Iowa Political Scientists was held April 16, 1955 on the Iowa State College campus at Ames. Panel discussions were held on the 1954 elections and on the recent session of the General Assembly of Iowa. Newly elected officers are: president, Richard C. Spencer, Coe College; secretary-treasurer, George B. Telford, Drake University.

The Tenth Annual Michigan Forum on State and Local Government was held at Michigan State University, June 23–July 28, 1955. Over 30 state and local government officials, including Governor G. Mennen Williams and Lieutenant Governor Philip A. Hart, participated in the panels and workshops. The forum was held to enable practitioners in government to meet with teachers and students for discussion of Michigan governmental operations. This project was a continuation of the program originally conceived and promoted by D. Hale Brake, chairman of the Michigan Institute of Local Government. Sponsoring organizations of this year's forum were the Michigan Institute of Local Government and the Michigan State University department of political science, in cooperation with the State Department of Public Instruction, the Michigan Municipal League, and the Michigan Citizenship Clearing House. Topics of panel sessions and workshops included: "Executive Leadership," "Legislative Process," "Judicial Process," "Local Government and Inter-Governmental Relations," "State and Local Finances," "Political Party-Interest Group Process," and "Progress in Michigan." Dr. Nathan Hakman, of the Michigan State University political science department, was chairman and coordinator of the 1955 program.

The annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Political Science and Public Administration Association was held in Harrisburg, April 22–23, 1955. Panel discussions on "Managing the Commonwealth's Affairs" and on "Intergovernmental Relations Re-examined" comprised the major part of the program. Joseph E. McLean, Commissioner of the Department of Conservation and Economic Development, New Jersey, gave an address on "State Administration—New Jersey Style."

At the business meeting President M. Nelson McGeary was directed to discuss with Governor Leader possibilities for implementation of an intern program in the Commonwealth's administration. Newly elected officers are: secretary-treasurer, Harry P. Griffiths, Department of Forests and Water; and executive committeemen, Harry K. Butcher and William C. Willis.

The Eastern Pennsylvania affiliate of the Citizenship Clearing House conducted a Workshop in Practical Politics at Haverford College, June 12–14, 1955. Twelve college and university teachers of political science studied the Pennsylvania Election Code, discussed precinct and campaign organization, listened to informal, off-the-record talks by both Republican and Democratic leaders from Harrisburg, Philadelphia, and the suburban counties, and by political writers from the larger newspapers, and exchanged ideas in relation to the workshop materials presented to them. The workshop was organized by Dr. G. Edward Janosik of the University of Pennsylvania.

The Southern Regional Conference of the Civil Service Assembly and the Bureau of Public Administration, University of Tennessee, sponsored a four-day Training Institute for Public Personnel Officers, June 14–17, 1955 on the campus of the University of

Tennessee in Knoxville. The institute was designed to provide an opportunity for staff members of public personnel agencies in the South to learn more about their specialties and the relation of these specialties to the field of personnel administration generally. Junior technicians received training in wage and salary administration and the techniques of internal recruitment and selection; a series of sessions provided a survey of fundamental principles and practices, conducted on a lecture-discussion basis. Senior technicians and administrators considered the problems involved in relationships between the personnel agency and department heads, supervisors, civil service boards, legislatures, and community groups. The last two days of the institute were devoted to a series of workshops on specific techniques: "Assessing Attitudes and Personality Patterns in Interviews," "The 'Factor Comparison' Approach to Job Evaluation," "Determining Minimum Qualification Requirements," and "Installing a Position Classification Plan."

Two hundred public officials and employees of federal, state, and local government participated in a Conference on Perspectives in the Public Service, conducted by the University of California at Berkeley on May 20 and 21, 1955. The conference, held in honor of Samuel C. May, professor of political science and director of the Bureau of Public Administration, who is now retiring after 33 years of service to the university, was organized into the following workshops: (1) The Changing Status of the Public Service, (2) Public Administration and Political Responsibility, (3) Education and Training for the Public Service, (4) Public Opinion and the Public Service, (5) Impact of Technology on Public Administration, and (6) The Public Servant's Role in Policy Formulation. In addition to the workshop reports, addresses were delivered to the plenary sessions of the conference, including one by Charles McKinley, of Reed College, President of the American Political Science Association, on the subject, "The Political Scientist and the Public Service"; one by Professor Leonard D. White of the University of Chicago, formerly President of the Association and President of the American Society for Public Administration, on the subject, "Foundations of the American Administrative System"; and another by Professor May on "Some Unsolved Problems Facing the Public Service."

The political science department of the University of California at Los Angeles, in cooperation with the California Chapter of the American Institute of Planners, sponsored the Second Annual Meeting of the Southern California Planning Institute, June 17–18, 1955. The subject of the meeting was "The Nature and Control of Urban Dispersal." Professor Ernest A. Engelbert, of UCLA, served as director of the meeting.

The Thirteenth Annual Institute on World Affairs was held at San Diego State College, August 1–19, 1955, under the direction of Professor Minos D. Generales and Dr. Ned V. Joy. The theme was " U.S. Foreign Policy—1955." The institute, which was part of the class offerings of the second summer session of the college, was open to all interested persons. It included a program of lectures by outstanding authorities, movies, round tables, and discussions.

A Second Institute on Records Management was offered during the summer session by the American University through its department of government and public administration, in cooperation with the National Archives and Records Service. Emphasis was placed on the effective and economical creation, maintenance, and retention of records in large organizations. Forty-two persons, representing many states and five foreign countries, attended the institute, which was under the direction of Professor Ernst Posner and Adjunct Professor Helen L. Chatfield.

During the summer session the American University through its department of government and public administration offered an "Institute in the Preservation and Administration of Archives Advanced," in cooperation with the National Archives and Records Service and the Maryland Hall of Records. Outstanding guest lecturers presented selected problems of archival administration. Professor Ernst Posner of the American University served as director.

In the course of its analysis of problems confronting political scientists in undergraduate and graduate teaching and training, the Northwestern University department of political science has to date held four major conferences. Three of these were previously reported in this REVIEW: Conference on Search for Relevant Concepts of Political Science;

Conference on Interrelationships of Political Science and Geography; and Conference on Political Theory and the Study of Politics. During June 14–17, 1955, approximately 35 students of political science, anthropology, psychology, and sociology met on the Northwestern University campus to examine recent experience in the development of "Analytic Systems." Four sessions were devoted to consideration of the following papers, which were distributed in advance of the conference: Talcott Parsons, professor of sociology at Harvard University, "Some Highlights of the General Theory of Action"; Charles E. Osgood, professor of psychology at the University of Illinois, "Behavior Theory and the Social Sciences"; Theodore Newcomb, professor of psychology at the University of Michigan, "Communicative Behavior"; and Harold Guetzkow, professor of psychology at Carnegie Institute at Technology, "Building Models about Small Groups." Following discussion of the four papers, two sessions were devoted to the applicability and significance of experience with analytic systems to the problems which political scientists wish to study.

The Sixth Annual Conference on Problems of American Foreign Policy was held at Indiana University the latter part of June. The subject was "Germany in the Free World." As in the past, the conference endeavored to bring together policymakers and a cross-section of citizen leadership.

The Seventh Annual Workshop on Problems in Indiana Government was held at Indiana University, June 20–July 8, 1955. Indiana school teachers, members of the League of Women Voters, and government students attended the intensive three weeks' course, which was made up of readings, lectures, and panel discussions. Assistant professor William J. Siffin of the Indiana University department of government conducted the workshop.

The Indiana University department of government is sponsoring a week of citizen information and civic preparation meetings October 24–28, 1955, including a three-day Governor's Conference, which will take the form of a report to the people by the administrators, and a regional meeting of the Citizenship Clearing House. Representatives of various Indiana civic groups as well as college delegations will be invited, and films of the conference will be distributed to interested organizations.

A conference on "The Role of Public Opinion Polls in the Study of Political Parties" was held in Ann Arbor, Michigan, April 28–30, 1955 under the sponsorship of the department of political science, University of Michigan. The conference was called by Professor James K. Pollock, who later chaired a panel on the topic of the conference at the meeting of the International Political Science Association in Stockholm. The conference brought together a group of political scientists, public opinion survey experts, and practicing politicians, in order to secure an exchange of views on the more important aspects of public opinion research as related to political parties. Among the major topics discussed at the conference were: "Voter Perceptions of the Political Party"; "How Can Public Opinion Polls Supplement Traditional Research in Political Parties?"; "Public Opinion Polling and Comparative Research in Political Parties"; and "Public Opinion Polls and American Politics." A full report on the work of the conference will be published at a later date.

A Conference on American Student Life and Higher Education was held at the University of Buffalo for visiting Fulbright Scholars, June 7–11, 1955. The Conference, which brought together 71 scholars from the United States and 15 foreign countries, was sponsored by the University of Buffalo in cooperation with the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils with funds provided by the Edward W. Hazen Foundation. Dr. Richard H. Heindel, professor of history and dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and Dr. Kurt P. Tauber, assistant professor of government, both of the University of Buffalo, were chairman and secretary, respectively, of the Conference.

The University of Minnesota held its second summer Institute on Minnesota Government and Politics during the last two weeks of July. Ten panels of some 60 legislators, administrators, civic leaders, and educators discussed such vital state problems and issues as constitutional revision, the presidential preference primary, party designation for legislators, censorship, the governor's office, veteran preference, sales tax, dedicated funds, school district reorganization, and regulation of public utilities. At a special dinner meeting, the governor, the chief justice, the speaker of the house of representatives, and the lieutenant governor discussed their respective roles in Minnesota's government. George A. Warp served as director of the institute.

An Institute on American Policy and Soviet Imperialism was held at the University of Washington, June 20–24, 1955 under the auspices of the Far Eastern and Russian Institute and the Institute of International Affairs of the University. The institute featured papers and addresses by members of the University of Washington faculty and a number of outside visitors. Professor William B. Ballis served as director of the institute.

A Workshop on the Middle East was held at Marshall College, June 6–24, 1955 under the sponsorship of the department of political science. Dr. Carl Leiden, associate professor of political science, directed the workshop and Professor Conley H. Dillon, head of the department, was a principal lecturer. Visiting lecturers were Mr. Hassan Saab, First Secretary of the Embassy of Lebanon; Mr. Shimoui, Counselor of the Embassy of Israel; and Mr. S. G. Khaliq, Educational and Cultural Attaché of the Pakistan Embassy.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Duke University, with the assistance of a grant of $350,000 by the Carnegie Corporation, has established a Center for British Commonwealth Studies which will be devoted primarily to the encouragement of research by Duke University professors and graduate students interested in the Commonwealth and the encouragement of research at Duke University by professors and graduate students from Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa on relevant economic, political, and historical problems. During its first year, the Center will offer assistance to those engaged in the following types of activity: (1) A number of outstanding social scientists and officials from the Commonwealth will deliver a series of lectures during the academic year 1955–56. It is anticipated that these lectures, dealing with various aspects of the developments in the Commonwealth, will be published in a series of publications dealing with Commonwealth problems. (2) A selected group of professors from the Commonwealth will visit Duke University for varying periods of time during the coming academic years. Professor K. C. Wheare, of Oxford University, will serve as visiting professor of political science during the second semester of 1955–56. Other individuals will be invited in the future to serve as visiting professors under conditions which will make it possible for them to combine their lecturing with research related to the Commonwealth or to their own special interests. (3) Advanced graduate students from Duke University are being assisted to complete research work on Ph.D. dissertations in the Commonwealth nations. A number of awards to students in economics, political science, and history have been made. (4) Consideration is being given to a select group of advanced graduate students from the Commonwealth who expect to complete work for the Ph.D. degree in relevant fields in the United States. (5) Financial assistance will be provided for members of the Duke University faculty whose research necessitates field work in the Commonwealth or special work on Commonwealth materials. The Committee on Commonwealth Studies is composed of Professors Taylor Cole, chairman, Calvin B. Hoover, Joseph J. Spengler, Paul H. Clyde, and Robert R. Wilson.

Harvard University has announced the establishment of a Defense Studies Program, designed to provide research and graduate study in the field of national defense policy and administration. The program has been established within the Harvard Graduate School of Public Administration and will be carried out with the assistance of a $214,000 grant from the Ford Foundation. An elective Defense Policy Seminar will be offered for graduate credit during 1955–56 and will be composed of students from Harvard's graduate schools of Law, Public Administration, Business Administration, and Arts and Sciences. This new program will be under the leadership of W. Barton Leach, professor of law at Harvard, who serves as director. Professor Leach was chief of Operations Analysis Branch, U. S. Army Air Forces, during World War II. He has also served as counsel and consultant to the Air Force in more recent years. Associate director of the Defense Studies Program is Dr. Edward L. Katzenbach, Jr., who has been assistant professor of history at Columbia College and research associate in the Institute for War and Peace Studies. Dr. Katzenbach will play a major role in the administration of the program. Dr. Harry H. Ransom, APSA Congressional Interne in 1953–54 and recently assistant professor of political science at Michigan State University, serves as Research Associate in the new program. In addition to the offering of a graduate seminar, the Harvard Defense Studies Program proposes to build national defense policy into a field of organized study. The greatly expanded role of the American military establishment in the making of national policy, and the impact of defense policy upon government, economics, and politics are believed to be such as to warrant increased academic attention to this field of study. Outstanding guest lecturers, both military and civilian, will assist in teaching the seminar. Staff members will also concentrate upon designing and conducting research on national defense policy. Teaching materials will be developed which are planned to be useful to other colleges and universities which may offer courses in defense policy. Plans are also under way for the publication of an American Journal of National Defense, to be devoted to scholarly discussions of defense policy and administration. The Defense Studies Program will be guided by an advisory committee composed of Harvard University faculty members, headed by Dean Edward S. Mason of the Graduate School of Public Administration.

In May, Indiana University and Thammasat University of Thailand entered into a three-year, FOA-sponsored contract providing for a program of assistance in the expansion and improvement of public administration training facilities in Thailand. Under the contract, the department of government of Indiana University will send a staff of nine members to Thailand and will bring approximately 20 Thai students to the United States each year for graduate training in administration. An Institute of Public Administration is to be established for the conduct of an expanded curriculum in public administration, research, library and reference services, consultative services, and in-service training programs for government officials. The Indiana University staff will assist in the development of these activities. The department of government will send an initial staff of five members to Thailand in September. Appointments to this staff include: Joseph B. Kingsburg, visiting professor of public administration; Joseph L. Sutton, visiting director of research; and Walter B. Johnson, visiting professor of public welfare administration. Edgar L. Shor, department of government, has been named training coordinator for the program.

Michigan State University has signed contracts with the Government of Vietnam and the Foreign Operations Administration for technical assistance to the government of Vietnam in the fields of political science and public administration, police administration, public finance, and related fields. The initial period of operation will be two years, and the amount of the contract $1,800,000 for substantive operations. The purpose of the program is to assist the Vietnamese government in establishing and operating a National Institute of Administration designed to improve the training and competence of government officials and employees, offer university-level instruction related to degree and certificate programs, develop a program of research in government and related areas, and improve the organization and technical functioning of the presidency, police, field administration, and local units of government. The Michigan State team will consist of 30 persons in the designated fields. Members of the political science department presently in Vietnam are: Edward W. Weidner, head of the department of political science at Michigan State University, chief adviser to the National Institute of Public Administration; Guy H. Fox, deputy adviser in charge of the degree and certificate program; Ralph H. Smuckler, deputy adviser in charge of research; John T. Dorsey, specialist in administrative communications and assistant professor in public administration degree courses. Charles C. Killingsworth, head of the department of economics at Michigan State University, has been appointed University Coordinator for the Vietnam Project, which is under the general direction of the Dean's committee headed by Milton E. Muelder, Dean of the College of Science and Arts. Wesley R. Fishel, associate professor of political science, is directing the Orientation and International Exchange programs of the Vietnam Project.

The political science department of the State University of Iowa has just participated in a semester's exploratory project of classroom teaching by means of closed circuit television and "talk-back" audio circuits. The experiment involved the decentralization of an

87-member class in comparative foreign governments into three smaller discussion groups, one of which was televised to the others, while all three groups were in constant open sound contact. The class was taught by Professors Hugh E. Kelso and Russell G. Whitesel.

A Summer Program on the Far East, first in an annual series of summer programs on world problem areas, was offered during the first term at the Ohio State University under the auspices of an interdepartmental committee on international studies. The program was directed by Professor Kazuo Kawai of the department of political science, and had the support of the Japan Society and the Asia Foundation.

The department of political science at the Pennsylvania State University is inaugurating a graduate program in public administration which will lead to a masters degree in public administration after a full year of work, beginning in September, 1955. It is planned to make scholarships available for persons chosen for this new curriculum.

Beginning with the 1955–56 academic year, a new graduate curriculum leading to the degree of Master of Science in City and Regional Planning will be offered by the University of Southern California. The new degree, which will require a minimum of one year of graduate study, will be awarded jointly by the School of Architecture and the School of Public Administration. In addition to these two schools, other University resources being used for the new curriculum are the Schools of Social Work and of Commerce, and the departments of economics, sociology, political science, and geography in the College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences.

A department of political science will be organized in September at the University of Houston (Texas) to replace the present government section of the social science division and the department of public administration. The new department of political science will consist of Professors David W. Knepper, chairman, and Thornton Sinclair, Associate Professor Pauline Yelderman, and Assistant Professors Welbourne Benton, Edward T. K. Chen, James Jensen, and Harold Jacobson, with other staff members to be added later.

James T. Watkins of Stanford University, Royden Dangerfield of the University of Illinois, James Gathings of Bucknell University, and Herman Pritchett of the University of Chicago were participants in the Sixth Annual Du Pont Educators Symposium in Wilmington, Delaware, June 20–30, 1955.

Vaclav L. Benes, Associate Professor of Government at Indiana University, spent the summer at the University of Wyoming as Visiting Professor of Political Science participating in the Institute of Russian Studies.

Professor Clarence A. Berdahl of the University of Illinois has been granted sabbatical leave for the first semester 1955–56 to complete his comprehensive study of the American Party System. Part of his time will be spent in Washington, D.C.

During the past summer, Wilfred E. Binkley of Ohio Northern University served as a member of panels on political parties at the meeting of the Canadian Historical Association and at the Stockholm Congress of the International Political Sicence Association.

Conley H. Dillon, professor and head of the department of political science at Marshall College, was a lecturer on public relations in the Labor Institute held at West Virginia University, August 8–13, 1955 under the joint sponsorship of the College of Commerce of the university and the American Federation of Labor.

John Perry Horlacher, chairman of the political science department at the University of Pennsylvania, has been named chairman of an interdisciplinary and interprofessional committee established under a research grant made to Pennsylvania Mental Health, Inc., for the purpose of devising a project to validate educational techniques currently being utilized by mental health associations throughout the United States.

Louis G. Kahle, associate professor of political science at the University of Missouri, will serve as chairman of the Regional Selection Committee (Region X) for the National Woodrow Wilson Fellowship Program during the 1955–56 academic year.

Professor Frank L. Klingberg of Southern University Carbondale, Illinois, was a member of the 1955 Summer School staff of the University of Illinois.

George A. Lanyi, of Oberlin College, conducted a six-weeks' seminar on "Germany Between East and West," under the auspices of the American College Council for Summer Studies Abroad. The seminar group spent four weeks in Bonn, and travelled to the Saar, Duesseldorf, and Berlin.

Walter H. C. Laves, Chairman of the Department of Government at Indiana University, has been reappointed for a four-year term on the Governing Board of the UNESCO Social Science Institute in Cologne, Germany.

Leslie Lipson, of the University of California (Berkeley), lectured at the Air War College, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, in September.

Edward H. Litchfield, dean of the Graduate School of Business and Public Administration, Cornell University, has been named the 12th chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh. He will direct the University's new ten-year development program to strengthen work in the humanities, social and physical sciences, and continue the growth of its professional schools. The new program may cost as much as $100,000,000. Dean Litchfield served as the executive director of the American Political Science Association from 1950 to 1953 and is now the treasurer of the Association. Before his appointment as dean at Cornell, he was director of civil affairs for the U. S. Military Government in Germany, under General Lucius D. Clay. He is president of the Governmental Affairs Institute, an active director of the AVCO Manufacturing Corporation, and a member of the executive committee of the International Political Science Association. He will assume his new duties on July 1, 1956.

Norman D. Palmer, professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania, was awarded the honorary degree of Doctor of Humane Letters, *honoris causa*, at the 134th Commencement of Colby College, June 13, 1955.

In May, C. Perry Patterson, professor of government at the University of Texas, conducted a special ceremony at Baylor University in connection with the organization of a new chapter of the national political science honorary fraternity, Pi Sigma Alpha. Professor Patterson was the original founder of the fraternity, which was inaugurated by the establishment of Alpha Chapter at the University of Texas in 1920. He served as national president from 1920 to 1932, and in the latter year he was elected honorary national president for life. The chartering of the new Baylor Chapter, Gamma Eta, brings the list of active chapters to 74. Also scheduled for chartering this spring are chapters at Duke University and the University of Rhode Island.

Professor Robert E. Scott of the University of Illinois has been granted a year's sabbatical leave to develop a comparison of Spanish and Latin American political institutions. Most of his time will be spent in Spain, but he will also visit Mexico.

Professor Clyde F. Snider of the University of Illinois has been granted sabbatical leave for the second semester of 1955–56 to continue work in the field of rural local government. Particular attention will be given to local government in New England.

Robert Strausz-Hupé, of the University of Pennsylvania, addressed the Sixth Indiana University Conference on Problems of American Foreign Policy, held June 24, 1955, on the subject, "Democracy in Germany."

At the State University of Iowa, Vernon Van Dyke served as chairman of the Committee to Survey the Role of the University in World Affairs. The extensive report of the committee appears as Document No. 80 in the series issued by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Dwight Waldo, of the University of California (Berkeley), delivered the annual Southern Regonal Training Program lectures at the University of Alabama in November, 1954. Professor Waldo also participated in the Conference on Democratic Theory, an activity of the Fund for American Studies (Volker Fund), at Buckhill Falls, Pennsylvania, June 22–30, 1955.

Leonard D. White of the University of Chicago has been awarded the Bancroft Prize in American History of $2000 for the third volume in his administrative history, *The Jacksonians*.

Francis O. Wilcox has been appointed by President Eisenhower as Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs. His main area of responsibility in the department will be problems relating to the United Nations and other international organizations in which the United States participates. He will succeed Assistant Secretary David McK. Key, who retired from his post on July 31. Dr. Wilcox has served since 1947 as chief of staff of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, under the chairmanships of Senators Vandenberg, Connally, Wiley, and George. He assumed his new duties on September 6.

PROGRAM OF THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

The Brookings Institution has recently announced various actions in connection with the reorganization of its work and program. On recommendation by President Robert D. Calkins, the Board of Trustees has clarified and reaffirmed the basic purposes and policy of the institution in the following terms:

"The Brookings Institution shall devote itself to the conduct and promotion of research, education, and publication primarily in the fields of economics and government. Its chief object shall be to advance knowledge and understanding of economic and political problems, both national and international and of the courses of action that may be pursued for dealing with them. Its purpose in advancing knowledge and understanding is to failitate the making of informed decisions in the public interest on matters of general concern.

"To that end the Institution shall seek to advance the art and use of research and education as an aid in the development of sound policy, organization, and practices in economic and governmental affairs.

"The Institution shall carry out these purposes in a thoroughly objective, nonpartisan, and independent manner, according to the recognized standards of scholarship. Its activities shall be designed to serve the general welfare and not the special interests of any economic, political, or other group in society."

The research program of the institution will focus on related lines of investigation in economics, government, and international relations. Its studies will thus be concerned primarily with (A) Problems of the American Economy, (B) Problems Relating to the Functions and Processes of American Government, and (C) Problems of International Economic and Political Relations.

The institution has received substantial financial grants from several foundations during the last two years. In 1954 the Ford Foundation made a grant of $1 million over a five-year period to assist in providing support for the institution's program in the areas of economic and governmental problems. Also in 1954, the Rockefeller Foundation made a grant of $375,000 in support of the institution's research and educational activities. Recent work in the area of international studies has been financed largely by the A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust.

An internal reorganization of the staff of the institution became effective on July 1, 1955, with the creation of two new executive positions. Paul T. David, who has served on the Brookings staff in several capacities since 1950, has been appointed Director of Governmental Studies. Robert W. Hartley, who joined the Brookings staff as a member of the International Studies Group in 1946 and has more recently served as director of the institution's project for a study of the United Nations, has been appointed Director of International Studies. The Economic Studies of the institution will continue under the personal direction of the President of the institution.

The principal research currently in progress in the field of governmental studies is a study of the politics of national party conventions, financed by the John Randolph Haynes and Dora Haynes Foundation of Los Angeles. This is being carried on by a staff headed by Dr. David and including Ralph M. Goldman, Charles A. H. Thomson, Richard C. Bain, John A. Ballard, Alice E. Robinson, and Francis M. Shattuck, with Professor Malcolm Moos of the Johns Hopkins University as a contributing consultant. A study of trends in American national party leadership was authorized for initiation in July 1955, under the direction of Ralph M. Goldman.

The principal research currently in progress in the field of international studies includes a study of major problems of United States foreign policy, by William Reitzel and associates, similar in scope to the institution's previously published studies on that subject, and the study of the United Nations. The latter study was begun in 1951 under the direction of Dr. Leo Pasvolsky. Upon his untimely death in 1953 Robert W. Hartley took over direction of the project. The research is nearing completion and will be published in seven volumes. The first volume, *The United Nations and the*

Maintenance of International Peace and Security, by Professor Leland M. Goodrich and Anne P. Simons, was published in June. Other volumes will follow during the fall and winter.

The Brookings Lectures were reinstituted in 1954 with a recently published series on Economics and Public Policy. The 1955 series was on Research Frontiers in Politics and Government, and included lectures by Stephen K. Bailey, Princeton University; Herbert A. Simon, Carnegie Institute of Technology; Robert A. Dahl, Yale University; Richard C. Snyder, Princeton University; Alfred de Grazia, Stanford University; Malcolm Moos, Johns Hopkins University; Paul T. David, Brookings Institution; and David B. Truman, Columbia University. The series is currently in press for publication by the institution. It is contemplated that the 1956 series will be in the general area of international studies.

An Interuniversity Summer Research Seminar on Presidential Nominating Politics, sponsored jointly by the Social Science Research Council and the Institution, was held at Washington from June 20 to August 12, 1955, under the chairmanship of Paul T. David of the institution's staff. Other full-time participants included Franklin M. Bridge, University of Arkansas; Harry R. Davis, Beloit College; Warren E. Miller, University of California (Berkeley); Lester G. Seligman, University of Oregon; Allan P. Sindler, Yale University; Stanley Kelley, Jr., and John H. Romani, Research Fellows of the Brookings Institution. In addition several consultants participated for varying periods of time, including Dayton D. McKean, University of Colorado; Malcolm Moos, Johns Hopkins University; David Easton, University of Chicago; James M. Burns, Williams College; and Kenneth W. Hechler, American Political Science Association.

The institution has resumed the granting of fellowships for research and training in economics and political science, and has announced the appointment of three Research Fellows in Political Science for the academic year 1955–56: Dr. Stanley Kelley, Jr., who will continue his research on "The Role of the Public Relations Man in Politics"; Dr. John H. Romani, who will engage in research on "Participation by Members of Congress in Presidential Nominating and Election Campaigns"; and Thomas S. Francis, who will continue his Columbia University doctoral research on "The Organization and Operation of Privately Sponsored Commissions of Inquiry." The fellows will be in residence for periods of eleven months and will receive stipends of $4,400.—Paul T. David.

APPOINTMENTS AND STAFF CHANGES

Charles R. Adrian, formerly of Wayne University, has joined the department of political science at Michigan State University.

David Apter, assistant professor of political science at Northwestern University will be on leave during the year 1955–56 for study in Africa of political institutional transfer in Uganda.

M. Margaret Ball, of Wellesley College, was visiting professor of political science at Stanford University during the summer quarter, 1955.

Robert Baum, of the Department of State, has been appointed lecturer in government science at the American University.

Curt F. Beck has been promoted to the rank of assistant professor in the department of government and international relations at the University of Connecticut.

George Belknap has returned to Michigan State University after serving as administrative assistant to Congressman Don Hayworth in Washington.

Robert P. Benedict resumed his teaching duties in September at Boston University after a sabbatical leave.

Oliver E. Benson has returned to his regular duties as professor of government at the University of Oklahoma following a year's leave of absence. During that time he was visiting professor of government at Northwestern University and participated in their curriculum reevaluation program.

Heinz Bertelsmann has been promoted to associate professor in international relations at Bard College.

Guthrie S. Birkhead, assistant professor of political science, Syracuse University, has been appointed director of research at the Public Administration Institute for Turkey and the Middle East. He will spend one year in this United Nations position.

Joseph E. Black has been promoted to associate professor of government at Miami University.

Thompson Black, Jr. has been promoted to associate professor of government at Los Angeles State College, and will also serve as head of the department.

John C. Bollens, of the University of California at Los Angeles, has been promoted to the rank of associate professor.

James E. Boyce, assistant professor of political science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has accepted a position as co-director of the South Asia research team of Associates for International Research, Inc., Cambridge, Massachusetts, in addition to his work at M.I.T.

C. Paul Bradley has been appointed assistant professor of government for the year 1955–56 at Oberlin College.

A. C. Breckenridge has been promoted to professor of political science and has resigned as chairman of the department of political science at the University of Nebraska to become Assistant for Academic Affairs to the Chancellor.

Herbert W. Briggs, of Cornell University, has been elected editor-in-chief of the *American Journal of International Law.*

Professor Denis W. Brogan of Cambridge University, England, has been appointed George A. Miller visiting Professor at the University of Illinois for the Spring semester 1955–56.

Everett S. Brown began his retirement furlough in June, 1955, from his position as professor of political science at the University of Michigan.

R. Jean Brownlee has been promoted to associate in political science at the University of Pennsylvania.

Eugene Burdick, of the University of California (Berkeley), has returned to the university after a year's leave of absence at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Palo Alto, California.

Ben G. Burnett has received his Ph.D. degree at the University of California (Los Angeles) and has been reappointed assistant professor of political science at Whittier College.

H. Paul Castleberry resumed his teaching duties at the State College of Washington in September after a two years' leave of absence while he served as Fulbright lecturer at the American University in Cairo, Egypt.

John W. Chapman has been promoted to assistant professor of government at Smith College.

John L. Chase, of the University of North Carolina, is visiting associate professor of government at Louisiana State University during 1955–56.

Carl Q. Christol, of the University of Southern California, was visiting professor of political science at the University of Nebraska during the 1955 summer session.

James B. Cristoph, of the University of Minnesota, has been appointed instructor in political science at the Ohio State University.

George A. Codding, Jr., under a grant from the Social Science Research Council, spent the past summer in France studying the French Socialist party in the post-World War II period. While in Europe Dr. Codding represented the University of Pennsylvania at the Third World Congress of Political Science held in Stockholm.

Morris H. Cohen, associate professor of government, Clark University, has been appointed a Fulbright lecturer in American governmental institutions at the Municipal University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands, for 1955–56.

James S. Coleman, University of California at Los Angeles, has been promoted to assistant professor.

Richard Howard Cox, who received the Ph.D. degree from the University of Chicago last year, has been appointed instructor in government at Harvard University for 1955–56.

Robert F. Curtis, formerly of the University of Michigan, has accepted an instructorship in political science at Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania.

George H. Deming, of the Office of Coordinator of Public Works, Council of Economic Advisers, has been appointed lecturer in public administration at the American University.

David Derge, instructor in political science at the University of Missouri, taught at Northwestern University during the summer session, 1955.

William C. Diez has been appointed professor of government at the University of Rochester. During the fall semester he is serving as acting chairman of the department of government.

Marshall E. Dimock has been appointed professor and head of the department of government at Washington Square College of Arts and Science, New York University, effective September 1.

James R. Donoghue has resumed his duties in political science at the University of Wisconsin on a full-time basis as director of the Bureau of Government, following more than a year's absence in a general administrative capacity in the Extension Division.

John T. Dorsey has been promoted to assistant professor of political science at Michigan State University.

G. Homer Durham, academic vice president and professor of political science, University of Utah, has been appointed Commissioner for the State of Utah on the Western Interestate Commission on Higher Education. He will serve as member of the Executive Commitee. Governor Lee of Utah has designated Professor Durham as vice chairman of the Utah Conference on Education.

William E. Ebenstein was visiting professor in political science at Michigan State University during the summer of 1955.

William C. Ellet, formerly of the University of Michigan, has been appointed to an instructorship in political science at the State University of Iowa.

Ernest A. Engelbert, of the University of California at Los Angeles, has been promoted to associate professor. During the spring semester Professor Engelbert served as consultant to the Joint-House Legislative Process Committee and to the Assembly Interim Committee on Governmental Organization, both committees of the California State Legislature.

John T. Everett, Jr., has joined the faculty of the Western College for Women at Oxford Ohio, as associate professor of political science and acting head of the department.

David G. Farrelly, associate professor of political science at the University of California (Los Angeles), is on sabbatical leave during the academic year 1955–56.

Milton Feder, formerly of the University of Michigan, has accepted an imstructorship in political science at Beloit College.

John H. Ferguson has been granted a leave of absence from the Pennsylvania State University to serve as Director of Program Research in the Executive Office of Governor Leader.

Vernon L. Ferwerda, who has been teaching at Trinity College under a temporary appointment as assistant professor of government, has been named to the faculty on a permanent basis.

Marguerite J. Fisher resumed her regular duties as associate professor of political science at Syracuse University last summer after having spent last year in research and lecturing in the Philippines and other parts of the Far East.

Peter J. Fliess, associate professor of government at Louisiana State University, will be on sabbatical leave for the year 1955–56 and will be teaching at the University of Frankfurt, Germany, under a Fulbright fellowship.

Thomas A. Flinn has been appointed instructor in the department of government at Oberlin College.

Raymond W. Foery has been promoted to associate in political science at the University of Pennsylvania.

Charles R. Foster, lecturer in the department of government at Indiana University during the spring and summer terms, has been appointed to an instructorship at Indiana for 1955–56.

Keener C. Frazer is on leave from the University of North Carolina during 1955–56 to lecture at the Naval War College.

Richard W. Gable has been appointed to the staff of the Institute for Administrative Affairs, University of Tehran.

John Gange, director of the Woodrow Wilson Department of Foreign Affairs, University of Virginia, has been granted a faculty fellowship by the Fund for the Advancement of Education and will be on leave during 1955–56 to survey the teaching of American foreign relations in various kinds of institutions in the United States, including military academies and technical schools as well as liberal arts colleges.

Manuel R. Gracía-Mora has been advanced to the rank of associate professor of political science at the University of Detroit.

John D. Gerletti returned to the University of Southern California School of Public Administration in September from New York City where he had held the position of General Manager of the International Association of Fire Chiefs during the past eighteen months.

Charles E. Gilbert, recently a member of the faculty at Oberlin College, has accepted a position as assistant professor of political science at Swarthmore College, beginning in September.

Gilbert F. Gilchrist, of the University of the South, has received a renewal of his Fulbright grant and a supplementary award by the Rockefeller Foundation to continue his research at the London School of Economics.

W. Leon Godshall, professor and head of the department of international relations at Lehigh University, taught at the University of Hawaii during the 1955 summer session.

Merrill R. Goodall, recently executive director of Cornell University's India program and co-director of its research center at Lucknow University, will be visiting associate professor of public administration at Pomona College during 1955–56. Dr. Goodall has been a staff member of the U. S. Civil Service Commission and has served as a consultant in public administration to the Indian and Nepal governments.

Samuel K. Gove, research assistant professor with the Institute of Government and Public Affairs, University of Illinois, has been awarded the 1955–56 Staff Fellowship of the National Municipal League. The award will enable Mr. Gove to serve for one year as a member of the staff of the League.

Frank Grace has been promoted to an associate professorship in political science at the University of Michigan.

J. A. C. Grant, University of California at Los Angeles, is on sabbatical leave during 1955–56 and will spend the year in Europe. During the summer, Professor Grant received a grant-in-aid from the Fund for the Republic to complete a study on the impact of federalism on civil liberties.

Elmer D. Graper retired last summer having served in the department of political science at the University of Pittsburgh since 1923 and as department head since 1930.

Feliks Gross of Brooklyn College and New York University, is a visiting professor on the faculty of the Woodrow Wilson Department of Foreign Affairs, University of Virginia, during 1955–56.

Elliott W. Guild, professor of government, Los Angeles State College, will be in western and central Europe on sabbatical leave from September to February.

Andrew Gyorgy has been promoted to professor of government at Boston University.

Andrew Hacker, who recently received a Ph.D. from Princeton University, has been appointed instructor in the department of government at Cornell University for 1955–56. He spent the past year at the University of Michigan studying political attitudes and motivation under a Social Science Research Council research training fellowship.

Rufus G. Hall, Jr., associate professor at the University of Oklahoma, has been reappointed to the chairmanship of the department of government for a four-year term.

Louis Halle has received a renewal of his appointment for another year as research professor in the Woodrow Wilson Department of Foreign Affairs at the University of Virginia and will continue his studies on limited warfare as an aspect of American foreign policy, particularly as illustrated in the Far East. He has been and will continue to be on a Ford Foundation grant.

Ray F. Harvey has resigned as head of the department of government, Graduate School of Arts and Science, New York University, to devote full time to his duties as Director of the Office of the Budget at New York University.

Carroll J. Hawkins has returned to Michigan State University after a year's sabbatical leave spent in Western Europe in the conduct of research on communism and trade liberalism.

Lawrence Herson has resigned his position as instructor in political science at Northwestern University to become assistant professor of political science at the Ohio State University, beginning his service there in the fall of 1955.

John Herz, who has been on leave during the past year from the City College of New York to engage in research on the theory of international politics under a Rockefeller fellowship, resumed his regular position in September.

Stanley Harry Hoffman, who received a doctorate in law at the University of Paris in 1954, has been appointed instructor in the department of government at Harvard University for 1955–56.

Arthur N. Holcombe retired during the past summer after serving for fifty years in the department of government at Harvard University.

Frederick Holladay Harris, of the University of North Carolina, will be a visiting assistant professor of political science at the University of the South during 1955–56.

Lynwood M. Holland was on leave from Emory University during the summer quarter to study municipal planning in England under a research grant.

W. V. Holloway, professor of political science at the University of Tulsa, is visiting professor of public administration in the School of Public Administration, Florida State University, during 1955–56.

Robert A. Horn, of Stanford University, was visiting professor at the University of Chicago during the past summer.

David Horton, of Westminster College, Fulton, Missouri, was visiting professor of political science at the University of Missouri during the summer session of 1955.

Charles D. Hounshell, who was recently promoted to associate professor of political science at Emory University, was on leave during the summer quarter studying parliamentary procedure in England under a research grant.

Thomas Hovet, Jr., who was visiting professor of government at Miami University during the past year, became assistant professor in September.

Ronald F. Howell, assistant professor of political science, Emory University, was visiting assistant professor at the Johns Hopkins University during the summer.

William C. Ide has left the American Embassy in Paris to become assistant program officer in the FOA Mission to Pakistan in Karachi.

Evan A. Iverson, Ph.D. candidate in the department of political science, University of Utah, has been appointed director of research for the Survey Commission on Local Government in Utah.

Norman Jacobson, of the University of Calfornia (Berkeley), has returned to the university after a year's leave of absence which was spent at the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton University.

Donald Bruce Johnson, of the University of Iowa, was a visiting professor of political science at Emory University during the summer quarter.

Franklyn A. Johnson, chairman of the division of social relations and business at Rollins College, has been promoted to associate professor of government. He has recently been appointed state chairman of the Committee on United Nations Day by Governor Collins.

Frank H. Jonas, associate professor of political science, University of Utah, taught at Vanderbilt University during the summer quarter, 1955.

S. Shepard Jones, for the past thirteen years a staff officer in the Department of State and formerly (1938–42) Director of the World Peace Foundation and lecturer at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, has joined the department of political science at the University of North Carolina as Burton Craige Visiting Professor of Jurisprudence for the year 1955–56.

Walbert W. Kaempfer, formerly with the Bureau of Public Administration, University of Alabama, has accepted a research assistant-ship in the Bureau for Government Research at West Virginia University.

Henry S. Kariel has been named instructor in government at Harvard University for 1955–56. He received the Ph.D. degree at the University of California in 1954.

John H. Kautsky, recently visiting assistant professor of government at the University of Rochester, has been appointed assistant professor of political science at Washington University, St. Louis.

William Keefe, associate professor of political science at the Pennsylvania College for Women, was a member of the Northwestern University summer session staff.

John P. Kennedy has returned to the University of Southern California after serving for a year in the Institute for Administrative Affairs, University of Tehran.

David Kettler, of Columbia University, has been appointed instructor in political science at the Ohio State University.

Otto Kirchheimer, formerly Chief of the Central European Branch of the Office of Intelligence Research, has accepted an appointment as professor of comparative law and government in the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science, New School for Social Research.

James Kitchens, of the University of California at Los Angeles, has accepted an assistant professorship in government at Southern Illinois University.

James R. Klonoski has been appointed instructor at the Henry Ford Community College in Dearborn, Michigan, for 1955–56.

Robert J. Koblitz, on leave from Bard College, is teaching comparative government and public administration at the University of Baroda, Baroda, India, on a Fulbright grant.

Louis E. Lambert has resumed his teaching duties at Indiana University after a semester's sabbatical leave in England.

Lane W. Lancaster, chairman of the department of political science at the University of Nebraska for many years, resumed that position effective July 1, 1955.

Robert S. Lancaster, dean of men at the University of the South, has been promoted to professor of political science. He has also been awarded a Fulbright grant to teach in Bagdad.

George A. Lanyi, of Oberlin College, will spend the academic year 1955–56 in London on a grant from the Fund for the Advancement of Education. He will study British methods of research in international relations and will gather material for a study of British foreign policy before World War II.

Joseph G. LaPalombara was appointed acting head of the department of political science, Michigan State University, during the summer of 1955.

John A. Larson, formerly research associate, Bureau of Public Administration at the University of Tennessee, has been appointed instructor in political science at the University of Michigan.

Hugh L. LeBlanc has been appointed assistant professor of political science at George Washington University.

John W. Lederle is serving as acting chairman of the department of political science at the University of Michigan during the first semester, 1955–1956.

Larry Leonard, formerly of the faculty of the New School for Social Research and more recently engaged in study in Europe, taught during the 1955 summer session at Northwestern University.

Professor Edward G. Lewis of the University of Illinois has been promoted to the rank of full professor.

J. Gus Liebenow, after completing the work for the Ph.D. degree at Northwestern University, will spend the year 1955–56 in field study in Africa, investigating political and economic leaders in British East Africa.

Norton E. Long, formerly of Western Reserve University, has accepted a professorship in political science at Michigan State University.

David Lowenthal, who received the Ph.D. degree from the New School for Social Research in 1953, has been appointed instructor of government at Harvard University for 1955–56.

S. Gale Lowrie, formerly chairman of the department of government at the University of Cincinnati, has been appointed visiting professor of government at Rollins College.

Arthur W. Macmahon, Eaton Professor of

Government at Columbia University, is serving as visiting lecturer in political science at Yale University during 1955–56.

John P. Mallan, formerly of Harvard University, will teach in the department of government at Smith College during 1955–56.

Gerald J. Mangone resumed his teaching duties at Swarthmore College in September after spending a year in Italy on a Fulbright research fellowship, studying Italian political parties.

Boyd A. Martin, professor of political science at the University of Idaho, has been appointed Dean of the College of Letters and Science, succeeding Dean T. S. Kerr, who retired on July 1, 1955.

Laurence W. Martin has been appointed instructor in political science at Yale University.

Roscoe C. Martin, chairman of the department of political science at Syracuse University, will be on leave for the fall semester, 1955–56, to conduct research in public administration.

Donald R. Matthews has been granted a year's leave of absence from Smith College to make a study of political behavior under a grant from the Social Science Research Council.

Albert A. Mavrinac has been appointed instructor in the department of government at Harvard University for 1955–56 after receiving the Ph.D. degree from that university in 1955.

Herbert McClosky, associate professor of political science at the University of Minnesota, has been invited to spend the coming year as a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, established by the Ford Foundation at Palo Alto.

William McGovern will serve as chairman of the Northwestern University political science department during 1955–56, succeeding Charles S. Hyneman, who held the chairmanship during the two preceding years.

Stuart H. McIntyre has been awarded a fellowship by the Southern Fellowships Fund and will be on leave from the University of Oklahoma during 1955–56 to complete his doctoral dissertation.

Charles H. McLaughlin, associate professor of political science at the University of Minnesota, will be on leave of absence during 1955–56 to serve as visiting associate professor at the University of California (Berkeley).

William K. Medlin, Intelligence Research Specialist, Department of State, has been appointed lecturer in government at the American University.

Charles A. Micaud, of the University of Virginia, is on leave during the current academic year to undertake a study in France of political and social developments, particularly with relationship to the continued influence of the Communist party in France.

Anthony Lee Milnar has been appointed associate professor of political science and history at Ohio Northern University.

Arthur J. Misner, of the Bureau of Public Administration, University of California (Berkeley), has been appointed assistant professor of government at Los Angeles State College, beginning in September.

G. Theodore Mitau, of Macalester College, will be a visiting professor of political science at the University of Nebraska during 1955–56.

Robert J. Morgan, of the University of Nebraska, taught at the University of Southern California during the 1955 summer session.

Frederick C. Mosher returned to the faculty of the department of political science at Syracuse University this fall after having spent the spring semester, 1955, at the University of California (Berkeley).

Lloyd D. Musolf, of Vassar College, has been appointed visiting associate professor of political science at the University of Michigan for the first semester, 1955–1956.

Lyndon R. Musolf has been appointed instructor in government at Pomona College.

Dalmas H. Nelson has been appointed instructor in political science at the University of Nebraska.

Randall H. Nelson has been appointed visiting lecturer in the department of government at Southern Illinois University for the year 1955–56.

James A. Norton returned to his regular position as associate professor of public administration at the Florida State University after a year's leave to serve as lecturer on public health administration at the Harvard School of Public Health.

J. Kimbrough Owen has been promoted to a full professorship in the department of government at Louisiana State University.

Daisy Parker, assistant professor of political science at the Florida State University, will be on leave of absence at the University of Virginia during 1955–56.

Malcolm B. Parsons, associate professor of public administration at the Florida State University, is teaching at the University of the Philippines during the current academic year under the joint program of FOA and the University of Michigan.

Julius Paul, recently on the faculties of the Ohio State University and Kenyon College, has been appointed assistant professor of government at Southern Illinois University.

George A. Peek, Jr., has been promoted to an associate professorship in political science at the University of Michigan. He is presently in the Philippines as the representative of the University of Michigan in the Institute of Public Administration at the University of the Philippines, established there by the University of Michigan in 1952.

Paul Piccard, of the University of Texas, is a visiting member of the department of political science at the Florida State University during the current academic year.

Frank A. Pinner, formerly of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, has been appointed to an instructorship in political science at Michigan State University.

Elmer Plischke, who has been serving as acting head of the department of government and politics at the University of Maryland, has been appointed professor and head of the department, effective July 1, 1955.

James K. Pollock, chairman of the department of political science, University of Michigan, will attend the Congress of the International Political Science Association at Stockholm and will be on sabbatical leave in Europe during the first semester, 1955–56.

Rollin B. Posey, professor of political science at Northwestern University, will be on leave during the year 1955–56 to develop the college department of Row Peterson & Company of Evanston, Illinois, at present one of the leading publishers of materials for elementary and high schools.

Addison Potter, of the University of Minnesota, joined the faculty of Los Angeles State College in September as assistant professor of government.

R. Vance Presthus has resumed his academic duties in the political science department at Michigan State University. Professor Presthus spent the 1954–55 academic year in Ankara, Turkey, as research director of the Public Administration Institute for Turkey and the Middle East.

James Prothro has returned to the Florida State University after a year's leave of absence during 1954–55 with a Ford Foundation fellowship at Columbia University.

Harry H. Ransom, assistant professor of political science at Michigan State University, has been appointed research associate, Defense Studies Program, Graduate School of Public Administration, Harvard University.

Ellsworth L. Raymond has been advanced to an associate professorship in government at New York University.

Fred W. Riggs, recently of the New York Office of the Public Administration Clearing House, has been appointed assistant professor of political science at Yale University.

Arnold A. Rogow, who was an instructor at the State University of Iowa 1952–54 and held a fellowship at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford University, during the academic year 1954–55, returned to the State University of Iowa in September as an assistant professor.

Robert H. Salisbury, who received the Ph.D. degree at the University of Illinois in June, has been appointed instructor in political science at Washington University, St. Louis.

Walter F. Scheffer, who recently received the doctoral degree from the University of Wisconsin, has been promoted to assistant professor of government at the University of Oklahoma.

Theodore R. Schellenberg, Director of Archival Management, National Archives and Records Service, has been appointed professorial lecturer at the American University.

Joseph A. Schlesinger has accepted an appointment as instructor in political science at Michigan State University.

John R. Schmidhauser, instructor in political science at the State University of Iowa, was on the staff at Kirksville State Teachers College, Kirksville, Missouri, during the summer term of 1955.

Carl J. Schneider will be on leave of absence from the University of Nebraska during the academic year 1955–56 doing research in Europe.

Glendon A. Schubert, Jr. has been promoted to the rank of associate professor of political science at Michigan State University. Professor Schubert was visiting associate professor of political science at the University of Minnesota during the spring term, 1955.

John Schutz, of Whittier College, spent the summer in the Bahama Islands where he was engaged in research on British colonial administration in the eighteenth century.

Harry M. Scoble, recently a visiting instructor in political science at the University of North Carolina, has joined the department of government at Boston University.

Harold J. Shamberger resigned in May as research associate in the Bureau for Government Research, West Virginia University, to join the staff of the New Jersey Manufacturers Association.

Samuel L. Sharp has been promoted to professor of international relations and organization at the American University.

Chandler Shaw, head of the department of history and political science at Bethany College, was visiting professor of political science at West Virginia University during the 1955 summer session.

Theodore Shay, after receiving the Ph.D. degree at Northwestern University, will spend the year 1955–56 in India where he will study the impact of certain bodies of political theory on the formation of the Indian Constitution.

Lewis B. Sims, who served for ten months with the second Hoover Commission, has resumed his duties as organization and methods examiner in the Office of the Surgeon General.

Thornton Sinclair has been advanced to professor of political science at the University of Houston (Texas).

Allan P. Sindler, recently of Duke University, has been appointed instructor in political science at Yale University.

Constance E. Smith has been promoted to assistant professor of government at Wheaton College, Norton, Massachusetts.

Reed M. Smith, who has been teaching part time at Brooklyn College, will serve as visiting instructor in the department of history and political science at Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea, Ohio, during 1955–56.

Rhoten A. Smith, assistant professor of political science at the University of Kansas, has been granted a one-year leave of absence to serve as associate director of the Citizenship Clearing House at the Law Center of New York University, beginning September 1, 1955.

Fred A. Sonderman has been promoted to assistant professor of political science at Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colorado.

C. E. Speakman, Jr. will continue on leave from the Woodrow Wilson Department of Foreign Affairs, University of Virginia, next year as a visiting professor of political science at the American University of Beirut.

David Spitz, associate professor of political science at the Ohio State University, has been awarded a Rockefeller fellowship in political theory and will be on leave for the academic year 1955–56. He also received a grant from the Fund for the Republic to carry on research during the summer of 1955.

Paul D. Stewart, of Marshall College, was a visiting member of the department of political science at West Virginia University during the 1955 summer session.

Ralph A. Straetz has been promoted to associate professor of government at Miami University.

Ulrich A. Straus, graduate student in political science at the University of Michigan, has been granted a Fulbright fellowship to study in Tokyo, Japan, during 1955–56.

K. Thor Swanson has been promoted to the rank of assistant professor in the department of history and political science at the State College of Washington.

Richard N. Swift has been promoted to associate professor of government at New York University.

Joseph Tanenhaus, assistant professor of government at New York University's Washington Square College of Arts and Science, has been appointed a Faculty Research Fellow of the Social Science Research Council in Washington for a three-year period. Beginning September 1, 1955, he will undertake a study of United States Supreme Court records and opinions in an effort to establish the relationship of judicial conclusions to the nature of the case, its origin, the parties involved, the briefs submitted, and the authorities cited. He will continue to teach at NYU for one semester each year.

Philip B. Taylor, of the political science department, University of Michigan, will be on leave of absence during the second semester of 1955–56 teaching at the University of California (Berkeley).

Richard W. Taylor, formerly assistant professor of political science at Lehigh University, has accepted an assistant professorship in political science at Wisconsin State College, Stevens Point, Wisconsin.

Stanley E. Thames, who received the Ph.D. from Duke University last June, will serve as assistant professor of political science and history at the University of the South during the academic year 1955–56.

Kenneth Thompson has resigned his position in the Northwestern University political science department to continue in his employment with the Rockefeller Foundation.

Frank N. Trager, research professor of government at New York University, has been designated director of a Burmese research project to be conducted at New York University during 1955–56.

Max Wesley Turner has been promoted to professor of government at Southern Illinois University.

Wayne W. Untereiner returned to the University of Southern California in September after an absence of one year. He has been engaged in research at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University.

John P. Vloyantes, of Pacific University, Oregon, has been promoted to assistant professor of political science, effective in September, 1955.

Harvey Walker, of the Ohio State University, will teach at Southern Illinois University during the spring quarter, 1956.

George A. Warp, associate professor of political science and associate director of the Public Administration Center at the University of Minnesota, will be on leave of absence during 1955–56 to serve as United Nations lecturer on local and municipal government at the School of Public Administration in Rio de Janeiro.

E. E. Weaver, associate professor of political science, University of Utah, has been appointed Commissioner on the Survey Commission on Local Government in Utah, and has been elected a member of the executive committee of the commission.

Troy R. Westmeyer has resigned his position as assistant professor of government at Boston University to devote full time to his work as Director of the Massachusetts Fiscal Survey Commission.

Allen S. Whiting, who spent the last two years in the Far East on a Ford Foundation fellowship, has been appointed to an assistant professorship in the department of political science at Michigan State University.

Francis M. Wilhoit has been appointed assistant professor of history and political science at Mercer University. He was also recently awarded a Fulbright Teacher's grant to Germany.

Paul G. Willis, assistant professor of government at Indiana University, has been granted an extension of his leave of absence so that he may continue during the first semester of 1955–56 as assistant to Paul M. Butler, Chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Glenn G. Wiltsey, professor and chairman of the department of government at the University of Rochester, is on leave of absence during the fall semester to study the relationships between administrative agencies and public prosecutors in enforcing regulatory legislation.

William O. Winter has been promoted to associate professor of government at Southern Illinois University.

S. Joseph Wodka, formerly at the University of Detroit, has been appointed assistant professor at Central Michigan College.

W. Howard Wriggins, assistant professor of political science at Vassar College, will undertake a two-year study of foreign policy-making in Ceylon this fall under a grant by the Rockefeller Foundation. He is the recipient of a one-semester Vassar College Fellowship for his research. After three months' research in England at the University of London and the Royal Institute of International Affairs, Professor Wriggins will go to Colombo, Ceylon.

Theodore P. Wright, Jr. has been appointed instructor in government at Bates College.

Paul N. Ylvisaker has resigned his position at Swarthmore College to accept a position with the Ford Foundation.

Emil Zaslawski, of the University of Miami, has accepted a position in the department of government at Southern Illinois University.

IN MEMORIAM

Boris Mirkine-Guetzevitch died in Paris on April 1, 1955. His death, at a comparatively young age, is a genuine loss for the two sister republics that he had loved so well and between which he commuted so regularly.

A great personality, Boris Mirkine-Guetzevitch in a way typified our age. He was born and educated in Czarist Russia, but as a dedicated and passionate democrat he fled from the Bolshevist Revolution. In Paris he did not follow in the path of so many Russian refugees; he refused to live in the past. Instead, he plunged into a new career, taught and lectured and wrote, and finally became an eminent and profoundly respected professor in some of France's greatest institutions of learning. Hitler made him flee to America and here, once more, he began a new career in a totally new world; and once again he achieved distinction and success. He was the moving spirit behind the Ecole Libre des Hautes Etudes, organized under the auspices of the New School for Social Research. To the end of his life he was the soul of the French University in New York, the independent institution into which the Ecole has developed, as well as professor in the Graduate Faculty of the New School. He lectured in many other institutions, including Harvard and Columbia, and occupied eminent posts in the fields of human rights and international affairs.

As a human being, Boris Mirkine-Guetzevitch was loved by everyone. He liked people and gave himself—his energies, his knowledge, his warmth, his help—to students and friends alike. There was a kindliness in him that was radiant. And the world reciprocated his love. He was a good man in the very deepest sense of that term. The ideals of freedom and democracy were a religion to him. He had fought for them all his life. His death will be greatly mourned by all of us. But his spirit will live on.—SAUL K. PADOVER.